

Methods of plant name formation used in the works by Jānis Ilsters

LINDA KURMIŅA

Latvian Language Institute of LU

KEYWORDS: botany terminology, plant names, word formation, Jānis Ilsters

The initial stages of botany terminology formation have been dealt with in numerous works (Vīksna 2002; Vimba 2001; Piete 2008) and its first achievements have most frequently been attributed to the botanist, teacher and poet Jānis Ilsters (1851–1889), who in 1883 published the first botany book in Latvian *Botānika tautas skolām un pašmācībai* (*Botany for folk schools and self-instruction*) (Ilsters 1883). This work only contained rather few most widespread names of plants, accompanied by more detailed descriptions.

As the main source for the present research of methods used in formation of plant names at the end of the 19th century the largest collections of botany terms by Jānis Ilsters *Latviešu botāniski nosaukumi* (*Latvian botany names*; Ilsters I, 1884; Ilsters II, 1885) were used. These collections were published in 1884 and 1885 in journals of Rīgas Latviešu biedrības Zinību komisija (Riga Latvian Society Commission of Science).

The present article discusses the formation methods of the names excerpted from Ilsters' plant name lists, also comparing them with plant names documented in later term sources, including modern ones, mainly *Botāniskā vārdnīca* by Pauls Galenieks (*Dictionary of botany*; BV 1950) and the dictionary by Inese Ēdelmane and Ārija Ozola *Latviešu valodas augu nosaukumi* (*Latvian Language Plant Names*; LVAN 2003). The analysis of the plant names published at the end of the 19th century helps to reveal the most characteristic formation methods used during the initial stages of the Latvian botany terminology.

Ilsters called for people's active participation in collection of plant names. This is proven by his afterword to the first list of plant names *Latviešu botāniski nosaukumi* published in 1884: "Vēl ir pulks generu, kuriem gan viņu vispārīgas izplatīšanās dēļ latviski nosaukumi vienā vai otrā vidū

atrasies. Tādēļ būtu derīgi, kad zinātāji uz priekšu tos ievērotu un varbūt Latviešu biedrības “Zinību Komisijai” piesūtītu priekš tālākas izlietāšanas, kas botānikas sarakstītājiem līdzētu pie viņu darba”¹ (Ilsters I, 1884: 81). His call was also answered – already in the second list of *Latviešu botāniski nosaukumi* (in 1885) the author publishes not only additions to his collection but also the collected material sent to him.

This means that Ilsters has included in both of his plant name lists the names collected by himself (these can be found on both the first and the second list) and the ones sent to him by other collectors (mainly on the second list). This material mainly includes plant names from Vidzeme, less represented are Kurzeme and Zemgale. The author’s own collections are from Stukmaņi, Koknese, Vestiena and Dundaga. On the other hand the most of the names contributed by other collectors come from Vidzeme (Liezere, Valmiera, Cēsis, Trikāta, Sigulda), with lesser representation of Kurzeme (Aizpute, Kuldīga) and Zemgale (Dobele). None of the two plant name lists compiled by Ilsters features any name from Latgale.

The material collected by Ilsters mainly comprises names of species, though there are some names of genera as well. In the preface to the first list (Ilsters 1884: 63–64) the author points out that many Latvian plant names have not yet been systematically arranged – quite often because of the similarities or differences of plants they may have been given inaccurate names. In some cases plants belonging to different genera have the same name and names of plants of the same genera are synonymous. Ilsters noted that specialists of botany would have to do something about these names in the future.

Both lists are arranged alphabetically. The Latin names are presented first, then one or more of their Latvian equivalents are given. In many cases the compiler’s comments are added next to the headword or possible explanation of the origin is suggested. At the end the German equivalent is given. For instance:

“*Hypericum L.*, asinszāles, raganukauli, krustenes, (strutenes); pēdējais nosaukums tādēļ tā, ka šī puķe apakš Kristus krusta stāvējusi un uz viņas Kristus asins pilējis. **Johannisblut, Hartheu.**”².

¹ Translation: “There are still many genera for which Latvian names can be found in one region or another due to their being so widespread. Therefore it would be useful that those who know them would in future note them, and maybe send them to the “Science Commission” of the Latvian Society for future use, which would help the recorders of botany in their work”.

² Translation: „*Hypericum L.*, asinszāles, raganukauli, krustenes, (strutenes); the last plant has such name because it grew next to the cross of Christ and Christ’s blood was dripping on it. **Johannisblut, Hartheu**”

As Anna Vulāne writes, language is in continuous process of development, with especially active changes on the lexical level. With new objects and notions being created and introduced as the result of social economic development, also the need for giving those possibly more exact names arises. One of the options to meet this need is to create new words and names. Although the intensity of use of one or some other method or means, the productivity and activity of the derivative type changes over time and even new methods and means are introduced, the information included in the word is retained (Vulāne 2008: 88). The examples related to flora may be indicative of: 1) location of growth (*purvene, zemenes*); 2) resemblance in appearance (*ķepaiņi, lācenes*); 3) time of blossoming or ripening (*jāņogas, mārīņpuķes*).

While analysing the corresponding plant names it was concluded that different methods of word formation have been used in their creation:

- word derivation or affixation, for example *kazenāji*³ (*Rubus caesius*), *naktenes* (*Solanum nigrum*), *rozītes* (*Bellis perennis*);
- creation of compounds, for example *gaiļugriķes* (*Convolvulus*);
- creation of word-group names, for example *dzeltenās kumeles* (*Ant-hemis tinctoria*), *veca vīra bārzdīņa* (*Thymus serpyllum*);
- creation of hyphenated names, for example *buku-vītols* (*Salix viminalis*), *laumas-slota* (*Apasagus officinalis*).

Further in the article each individual method of the mentioned above will be discussed in more detail.

1. DERIVATION OR AFFIXATION

In the material collected by Ilsters there are many such plant names that have been created as a result of word derivation or affixation, namely an affix – a prefix, suffix or derivative ending – being added to the word root or stem according to the word-formation models extant in the language. This is one of the most productive word formation methods in the Latvian language as such and also so in regard to plant name formation (VPSV 2007: 57; MLLVG I, 1959: 81; Kalme, Smiltņiece 2001: 42).

When deriving a new word usually a single affix is used, for example *pār-cel-t* → *ne-pār-cel-t*, *pār-cel-šan-a*, *pār-cēl-āj-s*. But there also are many words with two or more affixes, and the sequence of adding of these is difficult to establish, for example the adjective *ie-zilg-an-s* ('bluish')

³ Here and further the transcription of the examples follows the norms of the modern Latvian language.

may have been derived either from the word *ie-zilg-s* using the suffix *-an-* or from the word *zilg-an-s* with the prefix *ie-*. Some words still are derived using two affixes simultaneously – with a prefix and a suffix, for example, *pār-purv-o-t*; with a prefix and derivative ending, for example *aiz-skap-e*; with two suffixes, for example *ārst-niec-isk-s*. This is attested by the fact that these words have no corresponding motivating word with a single affix (*pārpurvs, purvot; aizskapis, skape*, etc.) (Kalme, Smiltnece 2001: 42–43).

The previously said may also be referred to the derivations of plant names, for example *čūsk-en-āj-i* (*Orchis maculata*), *zirdz-en-āj-s* (*Rubus fruticosus*).

The basis for a derived plant name may be a noun (for example, *blusenes* (*Polygonum persicaria*), *ziepene* (*Saponaria officinalis*)), an adjective (for example, *skābenes* (*Rumex*), *zilenes* (*Vaccinium uliginosum*)) as well as a verb (for example *noartnes* (*Pimpinella*)). These plant names may be divided into several groups:

- plant names derived with a suffix – in the analysed material the following suffixes have been found as used for derivation of plant names: *-āj-*, *-el-*, *-en-*, *-iņ-*, *-īt-*;
- plant names derived using a derivative ending.

Plant names derived using the suffix *-āj-*

MLLVG mentions that the suffix *-āj-* (respectively the ultima *-ājs*) is used to derive plant names from the noun stems, while it is rarely used today in formation of names (MLLVG I, 1959: 90). Judging by the plant names collected by Ilsters one can reach the conclusion that this suffix has been quite frequently used in formation of plant names.

MLLVG mentions several meanings created forming plant names with the suffix *-āj-*: a) from the names of berries, using the suffix *-āj-*, words are formed that either denote a single plant or – more frequently – a group of such plants; b) from different names of plants words are derived that denote a larger or smaller group of these plants or a location where these plants can be found in abundance (MLLVG I, 1959: 92). The lists of *Latviešu botāniski nosaukumi* only include such names of plants that belong to the first group, namely those denoting either a single plant or a group of such, beyond that the author indicates that the ultimas *-ājs*, *-āji* are frequently used in formation of names for bushes (including those for lilac): *avenāji* (*Rubus idaeus*), *bruklenājs* (*Vaccinium vitis idaea*),

dundurnāji (*Geum rivale*), *dzervenājs* (*Vaccinium oxycoccus*), *ērķšķogāji* (*Ribes grosularia*), *irbenājs* (*Viburnum opulus*), *kazenāji* (*Rubus caesius*), *spradzenājs* (*Fragaria collina*), *zemenājs* (*Fragaria vesca*).

Plant names derived using the suffix -el-

The words formed using the suffix *-el-* may be ancient derivations, and today this suffix is only productive in forming the diminutives (MLLVG I, 1959: 93, 94). Also in the lists of plant names by Ilsters there are few words with this suffix, while the ones found rather do not have the diminutive meaning for example, *spīdeles* (*Bellis perennis*).

Plant names derived using the suffix -en-

As stated in MLLVG the suffix *-en-* (respectively the ultima *-ene*) has been used to form a large group of plant, berry and mushroom names, and this is quite a productive suffix (MLLVG I, 1959: 95). In the material collected by Ilsters the following examples can be found: *cirvene* (*Alisma*), *elksnene* (*Agaricus subdulcis*), *kaulenes* (*Rubus saxatilis*), *lipene* (*Lychnis diurna*), *naktenes* (*Solanum nigrum*), *precenes* (*Aster salicifolius*), *rasenes* (*Drosera*), *trīsene* (*Briza media*), *vilnene* (*Agaricus subdulcis*), *vistenes* (*Empetrum nigrum*), *zīdenes* (*Centaurea*).

Plant names derived using the suffix -iņ-

Usually the suffix *-iņ-* is used to derive diminutive forms, with the meaning of both some real diminutive and emotionally subjective evaluation, still the diminutive meaning is neutralised when nouns with the ultimas *-iņš*, *-iņa* reach term status (MLLVG I, 1959: 112–113, 117), as in the case of, for example the following plant names: *auniņi* (*Erigeron acer*), *liniņi* (*Linaria vulgaris*), *plakstiņi* (*Alectrolophus*), *žagatiņa* (*Majanthemum bifolium*).

Plant names derived using the suffix -īt-

The suffix *-īt-* is a real diminutive suffix, however as in the case of the suffix *-iņ-* words formed using this suffix, when they acquire the characteristics of a term, lose the meaning of both endearment and diminutive (MLLVG I, 1959: 130–131). In the material collected by Ilsters the suffix *-īt-* appears to be frequently used in plant name formation, for example, plural *ancīši*, *dadziši* (*Agrimonia eupatoria*), *bārenīte* (*Viola tricolor*), *cepurītes* (*Campanula*), *kumelītes* (*Matricaria chamomilla*), *kurpītes* (*Aconitum lycoc-*

tonum), *pulkstenītes* (Campanula), *rozītes* (Bellis perennis), plural *sunīši* (Bidens), *trepīte* (Potentilla anserina).

Plant names derived using a derivative ending

A derivative ending is mostly used to form nouns, verbs and adverbs. In word formation the following derivative endings are used: *-a*, *-e*, *-is*, *-s*, *-t*, *-ies*, *-i*, *-u* (Vulāne 2008: 101). Two of those, namely *-e* un *-is* (plural *-i*) have been found used in formation of the excerpted plant names. The following examples can be listed from the plant name collection: *ziemele* (probably from *ziemelis* ‘north’) (Chrysanthemum leucanthemum) (cf. ME IV, 1929–1932: 742), *vizbuļi* (Anemone) (cf. Karulis II, 1992: 542). Plant names may be also derived by a prefix and a derivative ending, for example *egl-e* → ***pa-egl-is*** (Juniperus communis), or a compound name may be created to which the derivative ending is added, for example *sausa serde* ‘dry core’ → *saus-* + *serd-is* (Lonicera xylosteum), *tūtas* (*veida*) *lapa* ‘cornet (formed) leaf’ → *tūt-* + *lap-e* (Aquilegia vulgaris).

2. FORMATION OF COMPOUNDS

In the material of plant names collected by Ilsters compound names are quite frequent.

Compounds are names formed by uniting at least two independent words or their stems, and they function in the language as a single lexical unit. Uniting of words into compounds (in the same way as word derivation) is one of the most productive methods of new word formation in the modern Latvian language (VPSV 2007: 338; MLLVG I, 1959: 84; Kalme, Smiltneice 2001: 47). As noted by Vilma Kalme, different parts of speech may become the first component of a compound: nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns, verbs, adverbs (Kalme, Smiltneice 2001: 47–48). In compound names of plants the first part in most cases is a noun, for example ***miroņupuķe*** ‘corpse’s flower’ (Linaria vulgaris), ***mežarozīte*** ‘wood’s rose’ (Geranium), or an adjective, for example ***baltvēderiņi*** ‘white bellies’ (Potentilla anserina), ***mazpurenīte*** ‘small marsh marigold’ (Ranunculus ficaria). These are the two most productive types of compound plant name formation. Though more rarely the lists of plant names compiled by Ilsters also feature compounds with a numeral as the first part, for example ***septiņstarīte*** ‘seven rays’ (Trientalis europaea), ***vienlapa*** ‘one leaf’ (Parnassia palustris). The names formed as compounds can be divided into two component and three component compound names.

The two component compounds can be further divided into two sub-groups:

- compounds with their first part being a noun in genitive case without the ending, and most of the compound names in the material compiled by Ilsters belong to this type, for example *dzēlzzāle* ‘iron grass’ (*Echium vulgare*), *kaķaste* ‘cat’s tail’ (*Amarantus*), *lāčauzas* ‘bear’s oats’ (*Bromus secalinus*), *purveglīte* ‘bog’s fir’ (*Pedicularis*), *vārndeguns* ‘crow’s nose’ (*Delphinium consolida*), *velnābols* ‘devil’s apple’ (*Datura stramonium*);
- comparatively frequently the lists by Ilsters also contain compounds the first part of which are nouns in genitive case with the ending, for example *ceļāboliņš* ‘road’s clover’ (*Melilotus tournef*), *dzīparukarkls* ‘worsted sallow’ (*Salix acutifolia*), *meduspuķe* ‘honey flower’ (*Galium verum*), *mežarozīte* ‘wood’s rose’ (*Geranium*), *miroņupuķe* ‘corpse’s flower’ (*Linaria vulgaris*), *varžukājas* ‘froglegs’, *vārnukājas* ‘crow legs’ (*Comarum palustre*).

In comparison to modern sources of terms, specifically – *Botāniskā vārdnīca* by Galenieks and the dictionary by Ēdelmane and Ozola *Latviešu valodas augu nosaukumi*, it was observed that such compounds have either lost the ending of the first component or become word-group names:

lat. <i>Alchemilla vulgaris</i>	– la. <i>kroķulapas</i> (Ilsters I, 1884: 65)	→ <i>kroķu lapas</i> (LVAN 2003: 312)
lat. <i>Antennaria dioica</i>	– la. <i>kaķupēdiņas</i> (Ilsters I, 1884: 66)	→ <i>kaķpēdiņas</i> (BV 1950: 29)
lat. <i>Berberis vulgaris</i>	– la. <i>aluspuķe</i> (Ilsters I, 1884: 67)	→ <i>alus puķe</i> (LVAN 2003: 41)
lat. <i>Convallaria majalis</i>	– la. <i>zīdalapas</i> (Ilsters I, 1884: 67; Ilsters II, 70)	→ <i>zīdlapas</i> (LVAN 2003: 159)
lat. <i>Epilobium</i>	– la. <i>kazurozes</i> (Ilsters I, 1884: 70)	→ <i>kazrozes</i> (LVAN 2003: 148)
lat. <i>Mentha crispa</i>	– la. <i>krūzumētra</i> (Ilsters I, 1884: 74)	→ <i>krūzmētra</i> (LVAN 2003: 219)
lat. <i>Orchis</i>	– la. <i>dzegužupuķes</i> (Ilsters I, 1884: 74)	→ <i>dzegužpuķes</i> (BV 1950: 19)

The three component compounds are rare; in the collection of plant names by Ilsters only two such plant names were found: *ceļmallapas* (*Plantago*) and *caurduruzāles* (*Datura stramonium*).

3. FORMATION OF WORD-GROUP NAMES

Another productive method of plant name formation is creation of word-groups. Most frequently such groups consist of two or three components. Also four component word groups exist. One such example is provided by Ēdelmane – *dižā baltā ūdens lēpe* ('grand white water spatterdock') (Ēdelmane 1978: 101), but such examples are not numerous. On the lists of plant names compiled by Ilsters there are none.

The word-group plant names documented in the lists of *Latviešu botāniski nosaukumi* may be divided into two-component and three-component names.

According to Ēdelmane among plant names the most productive type of two component word-group names is the one containing a noun in the genitive case as the subordinate member (Ēdelmane 1978: 100). Also the material of plant names compiled by Ilsters features a significant number of such plant names. The following models of word-group names have been observed:

- a noun in singular / plural genitive case + independent component: *dzeguzes sietavas* 'cuckoo's puttees' (*Pinguicula vulgaris*), *mīlestības krūms* 'love bush' (*Myrica gale*), *zaķu skābenes* 'hare's sorrels' (*Osealis acetosella*);
- an adjective with the definitive ending in singular / plural + independent component: *dzeltenās kumeles* 'the yellow camomille' (*Anthemis tictoria*), *mīkstās nātres* 'the soft nettles' (*Lamium*), *pelēkais zirnis* 'the grey pea' (*Pisum arvense*);
- an adjective with the indefinite ending + independent component: *skarainas auzas* 'panicled oats' (*Avena sativa*);
- passive voice present tense declinable participle + independent component: *gremojama zāle* 'ruminating grass' (*Menyanthes trifoliata*), *vemjama zāle* 'vomiting grass' (*Morchella*).

Three component word-groups are rarer. The following models of three component word-group names were observed:

- an adjective with the definite ending in singular + noun in singular genitive case + independent component: *baltā Jāņa zāle* 'the white

Jānis' grass' (*Galium mollugo*), *dzeltenā Jāņa zāle* 'the yellow Jānis' grass' (*Galium verum*);

- two nouns in genitive case + independent component: *Poļu ķēniņa puķe* 'Polish king's flower' (*Campanula glomerata*);
- an adjective with the indefinite ending + a noun in singular genitive case + independent component: *veca vīra bārdziņa* 'old man's beard' (*Thymus serpyllum*);
- a numeral + a noun in plural genitive case + independent component: *deviņu vīru spēks* 'strength of nine men' (*Verodscum thapsus*), *septiņu vīru spēks* 'strength of seven men' (*Phyteuma spicatum*).

4. FORMATION OF HYPHENATED NAMES

In comparatively numerous cases Ilsters uses in the lists of *Latviešu botāniski nosaukumi* names the components of which are united by a hyphen, namely – the so-called hyphenated names. Valentīna Skujiņa in her book *Latviešu terminoloģijas izstrādes principi (The principles of Latvian terminology development)* points out that “17.–19. gs. latviešu rakstu avotos defise, resp., savienojuma zīme (=), lietota, lai parādītu vārdu vai vārda daļu ciešo jēdzienisko saistījumu”⁴ (Skujiņa 2002: 115–116), for example, in G. Mancelius' dictionary *Lettus* (Rīga, 1638) the following hyphenated plant names have been included: *Bisscha=krehsšliņi*, *ceļļa=lappa*, *Lahc=auzchi*, all of which are nowadays replaced by the corresponding compounds, as well as *Musschates=zeedi*, *Zirrdzenes=sacknis*, which are now designated by a word-group. According to the conclusions reached by Skujiņa in her terminology research, hyphenated groups in the modern Latvian language terminology are little used in comparison to development of the Latvian terminology over previous centuries. In most cases of plant names listed by Ilsters in the form of hyphenated names, for example *buku-vītols* (*Salix viminalis*), *lauka-naglens* (*Dianthus arenarius*), *laumas-slota* (*Asparagus officinalis*), *slotiņuciesa* (*Calamagrostis epigeios*), *zaķa-staipekņi* (*Lycopodium annotinum*) the modern sources avoids the use of the hyphen and either use compounds or word-groups.

⁴ Translation: “in document sources of the 17–19th century the hyphen, resp. the connection symbol (=) was used in order to show the tight notional relation of words or word parts”.

CONCLUSIONS

1. In the plant name material compiled by Ilsters the most productive word formation methods are derivation using suffixes and formation of compounds. Of different affixes the most frequently used are suffixes *-en-*, *-iņ-*, *-īt-*. The diminutive suffixes have usually lost the diminutive meaning.

2. Of compound names the most productive type are two-component compounds; the ending of the first component may be either retained or dropped.

3. The compound and word-group names mostly consist of two components. Besides those hyphenated names are used more frequently than in modern Latvian.

4. Although the Ilsters' work *Latviešu botāniski nosaukumi* is one of the first attempts to gather a substantial botany name material, this collected and classified material displays comparatively large diversity, that can serve as the basis for the future development of botany terminology.

SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BV 1950: *Botāniskā vārdnīca*. Sast. P. Galenieks, Rīga: Latvijas Valsts izdevniecība.
- Ēdelmane I. 1978: Augu nosaukumu darināšanas veidi latviešu valodā. – *Latviešu valodas kultūras jautājumi*, Rīga: Liesma, 97–103.
- Ilsters J. 1883: *Botānika tautas skolām un pašmācībai. Elementārkurss*, Rīga: Pūcišu Ģederta un biedra apgādībā.
- Ilsters J. I, 1884: Latviešu botāniski nosaukumi, krāti un sastādīti no J. Ilstera. – *Rīgas Latviešu biedrības Zinību komisijas 2. krājums*, Jelgava, drukāts un apgādāts no E. Sieslacka, 61–81.
- Ilsters J. II, 1885: Latviešu botāniski nosaukumi, sastādīti no J. Ilstera, Otrais salasiņums. – *Rīgas Latviešu biedrības Zinību komisijas 3. krājums*, Rīga: General-Kommisija, J. Kazimira grāmatu pārdotava, 68–74.
- Kalme V., Siltniece G. 2001: *Latviešu literārās valodas vārddarināšana un morfoloģija, Lokāmās vārdšķiras: Mācību grāmata*, Liepāja: LiePA.
- Karulis K. II, 1992: *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca II*, Rīga: Avots.
- LVAN 2003: – *Latviešu valodas augu nosaukumi*. Sast. I. Ēdelmane, Ā. Ozola, Rīga: Augsburgas institūts.
- ME IV 1929–1932: K. Mülenbacha. *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca*, rediģējis, papildinājis, turpinājis (nobeidzis – 4) J. Endzelīns, IV, Rīga: Kultūras fonda izdevums.
- MLLVG I 1959: *Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika I, Fonētika un morfoloģija*, Rīga: Latvijas PSR Zinātņu akadēmijas izdevniecība.
- Piete L. 2008: Pārmaiņas botānikas terminu darināšanā 19. gs. beigū un 20. gs. publikācijās. – *Letonikas otrais kongress. Valodniecības raksti – 2*, Rīga: Latvijas Zinātņu akadēmija, LU aģentūra “LU Latviešu valodas institūts”, Rīgas Pedagoģijas un izglītības vadības augstskola, 46–55.
- Skujiņa V. 2002: *Latviešu terminoloģijas izstrādes principi*, Rīga: Latviešu valodas institūts.
- Viksna M. 2002: Ar sava novada stāju tautasdziesmā. – *Latvijas Vēstnesis*, Nr. 161 (2736), 10.
- Vimba E. 2001: Botānikim Jāni Ilsteram –150. – *Dabas un vēstures kalendārs 2001*, Rīga, 223–228.
- VPSV 2007: *Valodniecības pamatterminu skaidrojošā vārdnīca*. Skujiņa Valentīna (red.), Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts.
- Vulāne A. 2008: Vārddarināšana. – *Latviešu valodas gramatika: koncepcija, prospekts, atsevišķu nodaļu pirmvarianti, diskusijas materiāli*, Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts, 87–112.

AUGALŲ VARDŲ DARYBOS BŪDAI JANIO ILSTERIO PUBLIKACIJOSE

Straipsnyje nagrinėjami XIX a. pabaigos latviški augalų vardai iš Janio Ilsterio (Jānis Ilsters) sąrašų *Latviešu botāniski nosaukumi* (Latviški botanikos vardai), pateiktų dviejuose Rygos latvių draugijos Mokslo komisijos raštų rinkiniuose, išleistuose 1884 m. ir 1885 m. Apžvelgiami šių vardų darybos būdai. J. Ilsterio sąrašuose pateikti augalų vardai lyginami su vardais, užfiksuotais vėlesniuose šaltiniuose.

Dažniausi J. Ilsterio surinktų latviškų augalų vardų darybos būdai – priesagų vedyba ir dūryba. Būdingas priesagų vedybos ypatumas – augalų vardai dažniausiai sudaromi su priesagomis *-en-*, *-in-*, *-īt-*. Mažybinės priesagos daugeliu atvejų yra netekusios mažybinės reikšmės.

Dažniausiai pasitaiko dūriniai su dviem sandais ir sudėtiniai dvižodžiai pavadinimai. Yra augalų vardų su brūkšneliu. Tokia raiška dabartinėje botanikos nomenklatūroje reta.

Nors J. Ilsterio augalų vardų sąrašai ir yra vienas pirmųjų bandymų surinkti latviškų augalų vardų medžiagą, tačiau sukaupti ir sutvarkyti duomenys atskleidžia didelę pavadinimų įvairovę ir gali būti naudingi plėtojant botanikos nomenklatūrą.

Gauta 2012-11-05

Linda Kurmiņa

Latvian Language Institute of LU

Akadēmijas laukumā 1, Rīga, LV-1050, Latvia

E-mail linda.kurmina@inbox.lv