NAIVE AND EXPERT MODELS IN THE LINGUISTIC REPRESENTATION OF REALITY: THE NAMES OF PLANTS

Ioan MILICĂ
"Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iaşi

„Zuerts versucht der Mensch die Natur von der Idee aus zu beherrschen"
Wilhelm von Humboldt

Abstract: *The analysis of the connections between popular and scientific terminologies is an area of research that various contemporary cognitive scientists consider of crucial importance for the description of the linguistic mechanisms used to coin names and for the analysis of the cognitive processes activated during the coinage and the use of a name assigned to a certain aspect of reality. The present paper describes some of the dominant features of two denominative models, folk and scientific, regarding plant names and outlines the most prominent onomasiological domains mirrored by the Romanian ethnobotanical terminology.*

Key words: *cognitive models, denominative properties, plant names.*

In cognitive linguistics, the notion of «cognitive model» is used to reveal that the same aspect of reality can be conceptualized and expressed differently by various speakers of the same language. The knowledge that human beings have and share about a certain fact of the surrounding reality forms the nucleus of the debate centered on the so-called principle of linguistic relativity[1], which means that the relationship between names and things has a central place in language sciences, despite the theoretical backgrounds and aims of the scientists concerned with this issue.

According to Ungerer & Schmid (1996: 50), "cognitive models are based on the assumption that many people have roughly the same basic knowledge about things". The cognitive models "are not universal but depend on the culture in which a person grows up and lives". Without being a novelty, the idea that human knowledge is built upon cognitive models could be used to distinguish between empirical and scientific knowledge. The two types of knowledge enforce the distinction between naïve (folk) and expert (scientific) models: "By a folk theory or cultural model I will mean some shared, structured knowledge that in many cases can be uncovered on the basis of ordinary language. Scientific, or expert, theories will simply be viewed here as the theories that experts, such as psychologists, philosophers, and the like, construct to account for a given area of experience" (KÖVECSES, 2004: 114). By stating that a cognitive model reveals an entire array of knowledge materialized in linguistic symbols and in the relationships among linguistic symbols, one can assert that language is the thesaurus that preserves bits

[1] The principle of linguistic relativity "which holds that all observers are not led by the same physical evidence to the same picture of the universe, unless their linguistic backgrounds are similar, or can in some way be calibrated" was stated by WHORF (1956: 214) but in the history of the ideas concerning the origin and the functions of language the issue is under scrutiny since Antiquity.

BDD-A5801 © 2010 Universitatea din Piteşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.239 (2026-11-06 21:54:37 UTC)

and facts of knowledge and the ensemble of linguistic resources used by the speakers to express their knowledge about certain aspects of reality.

Knowledge and *language*, explains M. Foucault (2003: 95) when bringing out the relationship between the two forces that define the human being – "are rigorously interwoven. They share, in representation, the same origin and the same functional principle; they support one another, complement one another, and criticize one another incessantly. In their most general form, both knowing and speaking consist first of all in the simultaneous analysis of representation, in the discrimination of its elements, in the establishing of the relations that combine those elements, and the possible sequences according to which they can be un-folded. It is in one and the same movement that the mind speaks and knows". The theoretical assumption examined by Foucault was developed by the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century, but its reverberations are still to be found in the tradition of various contemporary linguistic schools and doctrines, the Chomskyan generativism and the cognitive scientific paradigm being just two of the many illustrious examples.

The transfiguration of knowledge into symbols of language reveals the crucial role played by any idiom in relation to the speaker's mind and his understanding of reality. In the absence of a corresponding name, the mental representation of a certain aspect of reality remains just an indicible latency. Words communicate knowledge in the sense that they linguistically display facets of the way we conceive reality and, due to their communicative function, they allow us to observe how knowledge is linguistically structured and articulated.

Plants and their names are domains of knowledge that reveal the continuities and discontinuities between the folk and scientific models. Consequently, the common and distinctive features of the two models are worth examining if one takes into account that: a) in human culture, the folk denominative models precede the scientific denominative models which they undoubtedly influenced; and b) the influence of the naïve models upon the expert models becomes gradually weaker as the scientific models gain more and more prestige and autonomy to ultimately become sources that influence the naïve models.

All these considered, the paper aims at succinctly describing the dominant features of the naïve and expert denominative models[1], on the one hand, and the most important onomasiological domains reflected by folk plant terminology, on the other.

Features of the naïve model. The study of the Romanian ethnobotanical vocabulary[2] is a long-standing and well-represented area of scientific interest. The most valuable linguistic monograph written so far (Bejan, 1991) systematizes and continues the scientific effort aimed at clarifying the origin, the formation and the use of the words used by Romanian speakers as plant names. The dictionary of ethnobotanical terms compiled under the supervision of Al. Borza (1968) stands as an instructive and easy-to-use instrument for any researcher interested in the linguistic patterns and the onomasiological domains reflected by plant names. Furthermore, the Romanian bibliography concerning both folk and scientific botanical vocabularies comprises a list of a few hundred titles. A

[1] A more in-depth study could enrich or, on the contrary, invalidate the assumptions made in this paper which is ultimately limited to a brief presentation of the dominant properties representing the core of a very complex issue with a long and fertile research tradition.

[2] Both folk and scientific Romanian botanical names used in this paper are to be found in Bejan, 1991 and Borza, 1968.

BDD-A5801 © 2010 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.239 (2026-11-06 21:54:37 UTC)

chronological and critical analysis of the most relevant scientific contributions is carried out by Bejan[1] (1993).

The most important feature of the folk model is the *empirical dimension*, according to which plant naming is based on the observable properties of the botanical entities (see, for example, BEJAN, 1991): 1) the general aspect of the plant or of one of its parts: *ghimpoasă* (Arcticum lappa); 2) the colour of the plant or of one of its parts: *roşcovan* (Lactarius deliciosus); 3) the taste or the smell of the plant or of one of its parts: *amăruţă* (Picris hieracioides); *puturoasă* (Diplotaxis tenuifolia); 4) the "behaviour" of the plant: *adormite* (Pulsatilla vulgaris); 5) the properties of the sap: *lăptuci* (Lactarius deliciosus); 6) the use of the plant, with the following subtypes: a) medicinal: *holeră* (Xantium spinosum); b) magic: *ursitoare* (Chelidonium majus); c) ornamental: *bucuria-casei* (Begonia sanguinea); d) practical: *măturişcă* (Artemisia annua); 7) the place: a) of growth: *orzoaică de baltă* (Vallisneria spiralis); b) of origin: *tutun leşesc* (Nicotiana rustica); 8) the time of growth and blooming, with the following subtypes: a) the moment of the day: *zorele* (Convolvulus arvensis); b) the season: *primăveriţă* (Galanthus nivalis); c) the holidays: *crăciunele* (Rhipsalis crispata).

Another property of the naïve model is *the denominative variability*. The same plant has names that differ from one Romanian historical region to another, as witnessed by the following examples: *brîul Maicii Domnului*, *iarba şarpelui*, in Transylvania, *iarbă neagră şi mare*, in Wallachia (Phalaris arundinacea). The territorial variation of ethnobotanical names is marked both phonetically and morphologically, as illustrated by *aglice*/ *agrice, agliciu, agliş, agliţ*, *aglicea*/ *agricea*, *aglicel* (Filipendula vulgaris). The denominative variability is due to a complex number of linguistic and extralinguistic factors but the fact that speakers from various regions do not make clear-cut denominative distinctions between rather similar plants and the fact that the same botanical entity has received different names along history are, perhaps, cognitively relevant.

The denominative imprecision is, to a certain extent, the consequence of the denominative variability and it enforces the idea that one and the same name is used to make reference to different plants or that the same plant bears more than one folk name. For instance, the Romanian word *arginţică* acts as the name for plants like Dryas octopetala, Lithospermum arvense and Potentilla anserina of which the first two have flowers with similar shapes and colours whereas the third has golden flowers and silver-

[1] In the first part of his paper, Bejan (1991: 6) points out that the first written record of some Romanian plant names was found in a manuscript roughly dated "around 1700". According to Bejan, the manuscript includes a Slavo-Romanian glossary reproduced by M. Gaster in Chrestomaţie română (Romanian Chrestomathy), vol. I., Bucharest, Socec & Co., Leipzig, F. A. Brockhaus, 1891, p. 355-357. In Gaster's chrestomathy, the above mentioned document, dated in 1705, is published under the title *A Slavono-Romanian glossary of plants* (*Glosar de plante slavono-român*) and consists of two sections: "a glossary of herbs" (rom. "glosar de erburi") and "a glossary of trees" (rom. "glosar de pomi"). However, recently published research indicates that the first Romanian written record of plant names does not date from the beginning of the 18th century, as stated by Bejan, but from the middle of the 17th century. In the introductory study of *Dictionarium valachico-latinum*, The Romanian Academy Press, Bucharest, 2008, the editor of the dictionary concludes with clear and valid philological arguments that the dictionary was undoubtedly compiled by the middle of the 17th century "somewhere between 1640 and 1660" (CHIVU, 2008: 12). The editor also asserts that this Romanian-Latin dictionary "offers the richest inventory of ethnobotanical terms of all the Romanian writings up to the middle of the 18th century" (CHIVU, 2008: 60).

BDD-A5801 © 2010 Universitatea din Piteşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.239 (2026-11-06 21:54:37 UTC)

like leaves when reaching maturity. Nevertheless, the need to distinguish between similar plants reflects the so-called *denominative specialisation* of certain word-formation constituents. Plants with flowers of similar shapes and colours, such as Aster tripolium, Consolida regalis and Centaurea cyanus have Romanian folk names formed on the basis of the same lexical root but with different diminutival suffixes: albăstr*ică* (Aster tripolium) – albăstr*ioară* (Consolida regalis) - albăstr*iță* (Centaurea cyanus). The specialized use of certain suffixes to form plant names is more productive in the case of medicinal plant names formed by means of progressive derivation from the names of the diseases that the plants were believed to cure: bolând*ariță*, brânc*ariță*, negel*ariță* etc.

A very important feature of the naive model is the *vague denomination.* Unlike the denominative imprecision which reflects the oscillations in the use and dissemination of folk plant names, the vague denomination points out the relatively limited knowledge offered by the senses in the process of making essential differences among botanical realities in all given situations. The vague denomination is prominent mainly in compound names including generic ethnobotanical terms like *buruiană 'weed', iarbă 'grass', floare 'flower'*, to which different determinants underlining certain specific plant properties are added (see above, *the empiric dimension*). According to the dictionary coordinated by Al. Borza (1968), in Romanian language the model [*buruiană 'weed'* + determinant] forms around 200 names, the model [*floare 'flower'* + determinant] is evidenced by roughly 150 terms and the model [*grass* + determinant] is the most productive with over 400 compounds. The high productivity of the formative pattern [*generic ethnobotanical term* + *determinant*] calls attention to a less researched aspect, namely the fact that the generic terms reflect the "gender" and the determinants individualize "the species", as in the expert binomial model. This similitude demonstrates that the denominative features empirically achieved, though lacking the rigor and the precision of the scientific ones, highlight the speakers' horizon of knowledge and his understanding and categorization of the elements of the world. If one considers such ethnobotanical denominations as *buruiană de brâncă*, *buruiană dulce*, *buruiană păroasă*, *buruiană de sat* (Borza, 1968), one observes that the "gender" expressed by the word *buruiană* '*weed'* is linked the "species" expressed by determinants that identify: a) the disease cured by the plant (*buruiană de brâncă*); b) the taste of some parts of the plant (*buruiană dulce*); c) the aspect (*buruiană păroasă*) and d) the place of growth (*buruiană de sat*). On the other hand, it must be stressed that, in Romanian, the most productive word-building processes are derivation[1] and composition[2] so that a contrastive analysis between Romanian

[1] The main derivative models are: 1) suffixation: a) diminutival suffixes: *steluță* (Aster alpinus); *pipărușcă* (Capsicum annuum); b) augmentative suffixes: *brădoaie* (Abies alba); *zmeoaie* (Lingusticum mutellina); 2) prefixation: *desfăcătătoare* (Salvia aethiopis).

[2] Composition is a very complex process and includes the following denominative models: 1) compunds formed by coordination: *soarele-şi-luna* (Ranunculus auricomus); *ziua cu noaptea* (Melampyrum bihariense); 2) compounds formed by subordination, with the subtypes: a) noun + preposition + determinants: *coadă de găină* (Stellaria media); *trifoi de baltă* (Menyanthes trifoliata); *floare cu două cozi* (Tropaeolum majus); *lemn cu boabe albe* (Symphoricarpus albus); *flori ca stelele* (Coreopsis tinctoria); *muşcată ca nalba* (Pelagornium zonale); b) noun + determinants: *ciuperci oieşti* (Polyporus confusus), *fragi iepureşti* (Fragaria vesca); c) numeral + determinants: *cinci degete* (Potentilla alba); *trei fraţi pătaţi* (Viola arvensis), *trei cumnate supărate* (Aconitum stoerkeanum); *treizeci de arginți* (Lunaria annua); d) prepositional compounds (mainly attributive): *iarbă ce moaie vinele* (Impatiens balsamina); *văduva ce țipă*

BDD-A5801 © 2010 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.239 (2026-11-06 21:54:37 UTC)

ethnobotanical words and folk plant terminologies in other languages needs to take into consideration the genetic and structural particularities of the specific idioms in order to establish the degree of similarity between the naïve and scientific models.

Lastly, *cultural specificity* of the naïve models must be mentioned, since many plant names linguistically reflect practices, beliefs and human behaviours specific to a certain culture. For instance, among the Romanian plant names, there are terms that mirror the existence of two cultural layers, pre-Christian[1] and Christian[2], with different importance and poise in the collective linguistic imaginary.

Features of the expert model. The Swedish naturalist Carl von Linné (lat. Carolus Linnaeus) is the scholar who laid the scientific foundations of the denominative models in botanics and zoology[3]. Three centuries after the father of modern taxonomy stated the nomenclatural principles that stimulated the development of systematics in natural sciences, his ideas still lie at the basis of the botanical and zoological expert models.

One of the properties that separate the scientific from the folk model is *systematicity*. According to Linné (Rom. ed. 1999: 89), the systematic description represents the foundation of scientific research: "The first step of wisdom is to know ourselves; then the objects that we can differentiate among themselves and know by placing them in a classification and by properly naming them; thus, the classification that we make and the names that we give will form the basis of our science. (…) The one who studies the nature (the naturalist) is the one who correctly distinguishes the parts that form the nature and correctly names them according to their number and shape, to their placement and proportions among parts." Describing and naming, notes the Swedish scientist, must be done correctly, that is in accordance to the essence of the reality that the scientist researches. From this perspective, Nybakken (1959: 15) asserts that, in the scientific models in natural sciences, naming is done according to a naming scheme (*binary nomenclature*) and to a classifying scheme (*taxonomy*), and Stearn (1985: 16) comments that the scientific plant names represent "stipulative definitions", which are

---

copii (Inula britannica); *fisaică ce se urcă* (Phaseolus multiflorus); *muşcată care miroase* (Pelargonium odoratum) etc.

[1] Many plant names connected to the pre-Christian cultural layer reflect the belief in the existence of supernatural beings [*carul zînelor* (Arnica montana); *floarea smeului* (Aruncus vulgaris); *iarba alor din vînt* (Lycopodium clavalum); *sita ielelor* (Carlina acaulis)] or the belief in the effect of magic practices [*buruiană de ceas rău* (Lamium purpureum)].

[2] The plant names connected to the Christian cultural layer underline the belief in God and in the Mother of God [*mila-Domnului* (Ajuga laxmanni) > *milostivă* > *creştinească*; *poala Maicii Domnului* (Convolvulus arvensis); *coroana lui Isus*/ *Christos* (Passiflora coerulea)], the belief in the existence of heaven [*cheiţa raiului* (Commelina communis), *poarta raiului* (Tanacetum vulgare), *floarea raiului* (Allium montanum)], the belief in the existence of the saints [*iarba Sf. Ion* (Chamamenerion angustifolium), *Sfîntu Petru* (Iberis amara)] or the fear of the devil: *căruţa dracului* (Eryngium campestre).

[3] For a description of the historical conditions that favoured the genesis and dissemination of Linné's ideas, see Greene & Evermann (1912). A small anthology comprising fragments from Linné's letters was published in Romania by Váczy et al. (1999). Alcock (1876) published a very instructive and documented history of botanics till the 19th century and a consistent glossary in which he explains the etymologies of some of the most widely-spread scientific botanical terms. Among the best works on the scientific names of plants are those published by William T. Stearn (1966, third edition, reviewed, 1983) and David Gledhill (fourth, 2008). To capitalize on Greek and Latin in scientific terminology, see Nybakken (1959).

BDD-A5801 © 2010 Universitatea din Piteşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.239 (2026-11-06 21:54:37 UTC)

deliberate and arbitrary choices of the denominations given to certain realities. The systematicity of the scientific denominative pattern reflects its *arbitrariness*.

The nomenclatural specificity is another feature of the expert models showing that each area of scientific research has specific denominative needs (Nybakken, 1959). For instance, if botanical names are binary linguistic structures, in which the former term shows the gender, and the latter, the species [*Leontopodium alpinum* → lat. *Leontopodium* < gr. leonto-podion 'lion's foot' (GLEDHILL, 2008: 234) + lat. Alpinus, -a, -um 'which grows in the Alps or the in alpine area of some mountains' (Stearne, 1985: 383)], the scientific model in chemistry mainly consists of compound words whose constituents refer to primary substances and their combinations [*hexachlorocyclohexane*, insecticide made of chlorine and hydrogenated benzene].

The denominative precision is an essential feature of the expert models. According to this, a scientific term will suggest, as clearly as possible, the properties of the concept or of the thing it stands for. Nybakken (1959: 16) shows that, in botanics, the great number of genders and their crossing occasionally led to the emergence of scientific denominations based on anagrams [*Muilla* < *Allium*]. The denomination formed by anagram is motivated by the fact that the plant species belonging to the gender Muilla, though included in the family of the lily, have similar flowers to those of the gender Allium, this being the cognitive basis of the anagram. Otherwise, the denominative precision is, according to Linné (Rom. ed., 1999: 108), a fundamental condition in the formation of a botanical term: "The technical terms that are chosen need to be clear, to avoid confusions and errors." The naturalist even recommends that the gender names should reflect the essential characteristics of the plants, so that there must not be common denominations with those from zoology and mineralogy and there should not be botanical names borrowed from medicine (mainly from anatomy or pathology). Likewise, in forming the binary nomenclature, Linné (Rom. ed. 1999: 108 ff) rejects *hybrid names* (for instance, compounds with Greek and Latin terms to form a gender name), *paronomastic names* (sounding similarly), *names that do not come from Latin or Greek, names of saints* (but he accepts the borrowing of deity names) and *names of famous people* (with the exception of poets, royalty and botanists). Regarding names of species, the scholar recommends to avoid names referring to the *size* of the plant*, the place of growth, the colour, the smell, the taste, the use*, that is the "misleading" features (the term belongs to Linné) on which the ethnobotanical names are based.

Terminological stability is considered, even since the 18th century[1], maybe earlier, a condition without which scientific nomenclature could not have been differentiated from the folk one. Nybakken (1959: 23) asserts that, once formed, a scientific term cannot be changed either in form or in content, whereas Stearn (1985: 282 ff) notes that in the current *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature* some of Linné's recommendations have become prescriptions while others were rejected.

Economy and euphony are features that Nybakken (1959: 20-21) considers relevant for any scientific terminology. Otherwise, these traits have been suggested by the father of modern taxonomy, who claims that in botanical nomenclature one should avoid

[1] "The gender name must be unique within the same gender group. The gender name must be designated as durable before creating the name of the species. (…) It is not allowed to change gender names that are appropriate, even if we may find better ones." (Linné, Rom . ed., 1999: 108-109).

BDD-A5801 © 2010 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.239 (2026-11-06 21:54:37 UTC)

"gender names longer than 12 letters (nomina sesquipedalis), as well as disgraceful names." (LINNÉ, Rom. ed, 1999: 109).

Reality and naming. A description of onomasiological domains reflected in the semantics of the ethnobotanical names should highlight common and distinctive aspects of the two models. The issue of the denominative *continuity* and *creativity* is crucial in describing the similarities and differences between the naive and expert model. A detailed comparison of the two types of terminologies, popular and scientific, would lead to the conclusion that various Latin and Greek ethnobotanical terms have entered, in time, the scientific nomenclature. On the other hand, some Latin ethnobotanical names were inherited by most Romance languages and today, they are part of both the folk plant vocabulary and the scientific botanical terminology. A good example is Lat. *al(l)ium* whose Romanic descendants Rom. *ai*, It. *aglio*, Prov. *alh*, Fr. *ail*, Cat. *all*, Spain. *ajo*, Port. *alho* (KÖRTING, 1901:42) correspond to the scientific Latin name *Allium*, which designates the genus of the plants related to the onion. Moreover, in scientific botanical terminology[1] the genus name has a similar function as the family name and the name of the species acts as the first name, but the same thing cannot be said about the Romanic descendants of *al(l)ium*, inherited as folk plant names. Adopted by the scientific community, the genus name *Allium* became a universal scientific term used by all botanists, regardless of their cultural background or the language, whereas the folk plant names inherited from Lat. *al(l)ium* survive, sometimes as regional or archaic lexical elements, only in the Romanic world.

The influence of the naïve model upon the scientific model was followed by the influence of the expert model upon the folk model. An example of the force with which this influence is exerted is the Rom. *beladonă* that entered folk plant vocabulary as an equivalent of the older and more traditional *mătrăgună* (*mandragoră*, 'deadly nightshade'). Before its worldwide dissemination as part of the binomial nomenclature, the Italian word *belladonna*, recorded as folk botanical term since the 16th century, was put to scientific use by Carl von Linné who gave the deadly nightshade the scientific name *Atropa belladonna* < Gr. *Atropos*[2] and Ital. *belladonna*[3]. The example also reflects the scholarly origins of scientific terminology[4]. From the moment of acceptance and adoption

---

[1] The scientific botanical vocabulary is primarily based on Latin and Greek words, which means that botanical Latin is "an artificial language", a lingua franca of naturalists, a specialized variety of the Latin used by scholars from the 16th century (STEARN, 1985: 11). Botanical Latin reveals the efforts made by scientists in order to assign *correct* names to botanical entities, as stated by Linné.

[2] In Greek mythology, *Atropos* was "one of the Moirae, symbolizing the irreversible ending of life; she was often depicted holding a cutting tool, thus expressing the cutting of the thread of life" (KERNBACH, 1989: 58).

[3] The word belladonna 'beautiful lady' (see ALCOCK, 1876: 108; GLEDHILL, 2008: 68) points to the habit of Venetian women to use the juice or the decoction of deadly nightshade to embellish themselves, by making their cheeks pale, their freckles disappear and their eyes shine through the dilation of the pupils.

[4] Among the denominative domains pertaining to the botanical scientific terminology are: 1) characters of Greek and Latin mythology: *Achillea millefolium* (Rom. *coada-şoricelului*, Engl. *yarrow*) <the word Achillea comes from the Greek name of Achilles and refers to the plant used by great hero to heal Telephos (cf. LYONS, 1900:11), son of Hercules, in exchange for the promise to show to the Achaeans the way to Troy; 2) names of famous botanists: *Linnea borealis*; 3) **the** name of the discoverer or cultivator: *Gentiana asclepiadea* (Rom. *lumânărică*, BORZA, 1968: 75) < the scientific genus name was given in honor of the Illyrian king Gentius (LYONS,

BDD-A5801 © 2010 Universitatea din Piteşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.239 (2026-11-06 21:54:37 UTC)

of the term by the scientific community, the Latinized name of the species spread in many European languages and penetrated the general use, as equivalent of other ethnobotanical names: Fr. *belladone*, Engl. *belladonna*, Germ. *Belladonna*, Rom. *beladonă*.

Unlike expert sources of botanical nomenclature, rather oriented towards scholarly references and authorial originality[1], the sources of Romanian ethnobotanical names reveal the strong relationship of the human being with the surrounding universe and highlights the linguistic richness of the folk imaginary, with reference to: 1) body parts: *limbariță* (Alisma plantago-aquatica); *ochișoară* (Filago minima); 2) animals: *ursoaică* (Echium altissimum); *vulpoi* (Sorghum halepense); 3) birds: *buhă* (Taraxacum officinale); *vulturică* (Hieracium aurantiacum); 4) insects: *albină* (Ophrys cornuta); *puricică* (Polygonum persicaria); 5) plants: *grâușor* (Ficaria verna); *hrenuț* (Rumex crispus); 6) clothing: *rochia-doamnei* (Campanula rotundifolia); 7) ornaments: *cerceluț* (Fuchsia coccinea); *beteala-miresei* (Cymbalaria muralis); 8) food: *plăcințele* (Trollius europaeus); *untișor* (Taraxacum officinale); 9) religious objects: *cădelniță* (Campanula carpatica); *pristolnic* (Abutillon teophrasti); 10) objects of daily use: *căldăruşă* (Aquilegia vulgaris); *tăşculiță* (Bidens cernuus); 11) military objects: *sabie* (Iris germanica), *sulitică* (Dorycnium germanicum); 12) money: *bănuți* (Bellis perennis), *părăluțe* (Bellis perennis); 13) the sacred: *mila-Domnului* (Ajuga laxmanni); *cheița raiului* (Commelina communis); 14) the fabulous: *vrăjitoare* (Circaea lutetiana); *zmeoaică* (Laserpitium latifolium); 15) human relationships: *cumătră* (Erodium cicutarium); *uncheşel* (Nigella damascena); 16) ethnical origin: *unguraş* (Marrubium peregrinum); *țigănaşi* (Tagetes patula); 17) time: *primăveriță* (Galanthus nivalis); *zorele* (Convolvulus arvensis); 18) space: *dosnică* (Cerinthe minor); *grohotiş* (Rhinanthus glaber); 19) celestial bodies: *steluță* (Aster amellus); *soare and lună* (Ranunculus auricomus) etc.

Final considerations. A thorough research of the sources on which the naive and expert naming of plants is based could bring a lot of new data on how human beings conceptualize and name the realities of the world. The complexity of the problem raised by such an undertaking was and still is an obstacle to obtaining valid and standing scientific results. Consequently, the present paper is an attempt that precedes a more comprehensive description of the Romanian plant names. A comparison between Romanian ethnobotanical vocabulary and other Romanic folk plant terminologies could allow a better evaluation of the linguistic and conceptual similarities and dissimilarities, especially since the cultural prestige of Western Romance languages eased the passage of some terms from the folk to the expert denominative model and the other way around, so that the path to follow in order to ensure the accuracy of the interpretation is the diachronic description. At the same time, a linguistically-grounded study of the botanical scientific terminology would allow a better understanding of some conceptual-denominative phenomena whose productivity is often underestimated or neglected, metonymy and metaphor being notorious examples in this respect.

Last but not least, the influence of the expert model on the naïve model is worth describing in the context of historical realities in order to find out the length at which the

---

1900: 171), who is believed to have discovered the healing properties of the plants belonging to the genus that bears his name.

[1] It is worth mentioning that the scientific botanical nomenclature is often accompanied by the name or the initial of the scholar who gave the scientific name, which shows that this model illustrates the existence of individual creativity, while the popular model reflects the existence of anonymous and collective creativity.

BDD-A5801 © 2010 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.239 (2026-11-06 21:54:37 UTC)

progress of material civilization and the expansion of the speakers' horizon of knowledge contribute to the enrichment of any language with new plant names.

REFERENCES

Alcock, Randal Hilbert, *Botanical Names for English Readers*, L. Reeve & Co., London, 1876
Bejan, Dumitru, *Nume româneşti de plante*, Editura Dacia, Cluj, 1991
Borza, Al. (coord.), *Dicţionar etnobotanic*, Editura Academiei, Bucharest, 1968
Chivu, Gheorghe (ed.), *Dictionarium valachico-latinum* (DVL), Editura Academiei, Bucharest, 2008
Foucault, Michel, *The order of things*, London, Routledge, 2003
Gledhill, David, *The Names of Plants*, Cambridge University Press, 2008
Greene, Edward Lee, Evermann, Barton Warren, *Carolus Linnaeus*, Christopher Sower Company, Philadelphia, 1912
Humboldt, Wilhelm von, *Despre diversitatea structurală a limbilor şi influenţa ei asupra dezvoltării spirituale a umanităţii*, translated by Eugen Munteanu, Editura Humanitas, Bucharest, 2008
Kernbach, Victor, *Dicţionar de mitologie generală*, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucharest, 1989
Körting, Gustav, *Lateinisch-Romanisches Wörterbuch*, Druck und Verlag von Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn, 1901
Kövecses, Zoltan, *Metaphor and Emotion. Language, Culture and Body in Human Feeling*, Cambridge University Press, 2004
Lyons, A. B., *Plant Names, Scientific and Popular*, Nelson, Baker & Co., Publishers, Detroit, 1900
Nybakken, Oscar E., *Greek and Latin in Scientific Terminology*, The Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa, 1959
Stearn, William, *Botanical Latin,* David & Charles, Newton Abbot, London, North Pomfret, 1985
Ungerer, Friedrich, Schmid, Hans-Jörg, *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*, Longman, London, New York, 1996
Váczy, Kálmán, Aurel Ardelean, Bartók Katalin, 1999, *Carl Linné (1707-1778). Viaţă, operă, destăinuiri*, Editura Risoprint, Cluj-Napoca
Whorf, Benjamin L., *Language, Thought and Reality*, The Techonology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, London, 1956

This research was made possible with the support of the Project POSDRU/89/1.5/S/49944, Developing the Innovation Capacity and Improving the Impact of Research through Post-doctoral Programmes.

BDD-A5801 © 2010 Universitatea din Piteşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.239 (2026-11-06 21:54:37 UTC)