



## Semantic structure of word-formation nests based on one Adyghe root in the Adyghe linguoculture

M. L. Kardanov<sup>1</sup>, M. Y. Ezaova<sup>1</sup>, J. Kh. Shugusheva<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Kabardino-Balkarian State University named after H. M. Berbekov, 173 Chernyshevsky str., Nalchik, Kabardino-Balkar Republic, 360004, Russian Federation

DOI: 10.18255/2412-6519-2023-3-314-323

Research article  
Full text in English

Modern etymological and historical-semasiological studies, not limited to the framework of purely linguistic schemes, come to a cognitive nature. Such a scientific interdisciplinary approach provides the required depth to etymological and historical-semasiological analysis in content and word-formation aspects and corresponds to the modern humanitarian paradigm. Such a comprehensive approach to the study of the facts of the language is relevant, first of all, for research on the material of modern young-written languages that do not have a long-written tradition, which includes the Abkhaz-Adyghe. This article provides a multi-aspect analysis of a single Adyghe sound-root morpheme, which has not yet been considered as the starting base for the emergence of all derived words and all meanings that appeared as a result of its semantic evolution, that is, in all its lexical and word-formation diversity. All derived words in the article are combined into a lexical nest, which allows them to be considered in structural and substantive terms, so they form a systemic unity. The article also analyzes semantic and typological transitions of meanings related by etymological meaning and root morpheme.

**Keywords:** morpheme; root; semantics; etymology; Adyghe language

### INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Kardanov, Musadin L.	E-mail: <a href="mailto:musadin07@mail.ru">musadin07@mail.ru</a> ORCID iD: 0000-0002-3393-549X Cand. Sc. (Philology)
Ezaova, Madina Y.	E-mail: <a href="mailto:madinaezaova@mail.ru">madinaezaova@mail.ru</a> ORCID iD: 0000-0002-0574-7299 Cand. Sc. (Philology)
Shugusheva, Juleta Kh.	E-mail: <a href="mailto:shugushd@mail.ru">shugushd@mail.ru</a> ORCID iD: 0000-0001-7162-5057 Cand. Sc. (Philology)

**For citation:** Kardanov M. L., Ezaova M. Y., Shugusheva J. Kh. Semantic structure of word-formation nests based on one Adyghe root in the Adyghe linguoculture // Social'nye i gumanitarnye znaniya. 2023. Vol. 9, No. 3. P. 314-323.



## Семантическая структура словообразовательных гнезд на основе одного адыгского корня в адыгской лингвокультуре

М. Л. Карданов<sup>1</sup>, М. Ю. Езаова<sup>1</sup>, Д. Х. Шугушева<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Кабардино-Балкарский государственный университет им. Х. М. Бербекова, ул. Чернышевского, 173, Нальчик, Кабардино-Балкарская Республика, 360004, Российская Федерация

DOI: 10.18255/2412-6519-2023-3-314-323  
УДК 81.25

Научная статья  
Полный текст на английском языке

Современные этимологические и историко-семасиологические исследования, не ограничиваясь рамками чисто языковых схем, выходят на когнитивный, ментальный уровень и приобретают не только описательный, но и объяснительный характер. Такой научный междисциплинарный подход обеспечивает необходимую глубину этимологическому и историко-семасиологическому анализу в содержательном и словообразовательном аспектах и соответствует современной гуманитарной парадигме. Подобный комплексный подход к изучению фактов языка актуален прежде всего для исследований на материале современных младописьменных языков, не имеющих длительной письменной традиции, к которым относятся и абхазо-адыгские. В данной статье проводится полиаспектный анализ отдельно взятой адыгской звуко-корневой морфемы гъу, которую до сих пор не рассматривали в качестве исходной базы для возникновения всех производных слов и всех значений, появившихся вследствие ее семантической эволюции, то есть во всем ее лексическом и словообразовательном многообразии. Все производные слова в статье объединены в лексическое гнездо, что позволяет их рассматривать в структурном и содержательном планах, так они формируют системное единство. В статье также анализируются семантико-типологические переходы значений, связанных этимологическим значением и корневой морфемой.

**Ключевые слова:** морфема; корень; семантика; этимология; адыгский язык

### ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРАХ

Карданов, Мусадин Латифович	E-mail: <a href="mailto:musadin07@mail.ru">musadin07@mail.ru</a> ORCID iD: 0000-0002-3393-549X Кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры кабардино-черкесского языка и литературы
Езаова, Мадина Юрьевна	E-mail: <a href="mailto:madinaezaova@mail.ru">madinaezaova@mail.ru</a> ORCID iD: 0000-0002-0574-7299 Кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры кабардино-черкесского языка и литературы
Шугушева, Джулета Хабасовна	E-mail: <a href="mailto:shugushd@mail.ru">shugushd@mail.ru</a> ORCID iD: 0000-0001-7162-5057 Кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры кабардино-черкесского языка и литературы

**Для цитирования:** Карданов М. Л., Езаова М. Ю., Шугушева Д. Х. Семантическая структура словообразовательных гнезд на основе одного адыгского корня в адыгской лингвокультуре // Социальные и гуманитарные знания. 2023. Том 9, № 3. С. 314-323. (на англ. яз.)

© ЯРГУ, 2023

Статья открытого доступа под лицензией CC BY (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

## Introduction

As is known, etymological science takes into account both the laws of phonetic correspondence and semasiological connections (semantic transfers) that exist between different words, as well as facts obtained as a result of comparing linguistic data of related languages or variants of one language. The most effective methods used in etymology are external and internal extrapolations, the essence of which is to identify missing links in the historical development of the word, reconstructed during the study, based on existing semantic and word-formation correspondences and relationships. The significance of etymology is due to the fact that it, like no other field of linguistics, accumulates «modern data, written history, pre-written reconstruction and semantic typology» for the purposes of its research [1, p. 148]. The modern stage of etymological research is distinguished by the fact that etymology goes beyond the limits of sound-semantic correspondences and increasingly applies methods of deep comprehension of linguistic processes based on cognition. As the famous scientist M. M. Makovsky writes: «It must be borne in mind that in a number of cases the secret of another word or a whole family of words may be hidden in one word, and in these words the secret of human thinking or even the secret of human being may be hidden. ... Only an etymological analysis can reveal outwardly completely non-obvious connections and show the absence of connections that are outwardly quite obvious» [2, p. 202].

The need for an anthropocentric approach in the analysis of language is, in our opinion, one of the important tasks in linguistics today. The world is perceived by an individual with the assistance of a language in which the historical and social experience of an ethnic group is fixed. Vocabulary, as you know, is the most dynamic part of the language. Since a word is always subject-oriented, it can be borrowed and formed from the elements available in the language. Being the product of a long historical development, the language undergoes great changes due to various reasons. These changes affect all aspects of the language structure [3, p. 176].

Cognitive modeling of the lexical nest on the Adyghe material is relevant for numerous reasons, because the issues of word formation, semantics, as well as the problem of the hierarchy of motivational features between single-root words remain unresolved. Starting the analysis, it is necessary to address the issue of differentiation of such concepts as lexical, word-formation, root and etymological nests. Despite the proximity of these concepts, there are subtle differences between them. The word-formation structure of a lexical nest, understood as a word-formation nest, can form several word-formation nests inside the lexical nest, formed on the basis of various word-formation models that differ in their way of reflecting reality.

Thus, the word-formation nest is not a linear system, but a complex multi-vector formation, the distinguishing feature of which is the variety of word-formation types that form it. In turn, the root nests are based on connected roots, so a root nest can consist of two or more sub-nests, between which there are no word-formation connections, which may have originally existed, but disappeared in the course of historical development. A complex structural and semantic description of a lexical nest begins with the initial stage of its formation, i.e. S. Y. Voronin also introduces the concept of a sound-imaginative system, which he understands as part of the archisystem of the language, in the words of which there is a necessary, essential, repetitive and relatively stable involuntary phonetic primarily motivated connection between the phonemes of the word and the denotation sign (motive), which is the basis of the nomination [4, p. 176].

Thus, the structural and content boundaries of nests of various types remain very blurred. A word-formation nest is a sequential development of an etymological or root nest. «A word-formation nest, being a system of semantically and structurally related lexemes formed as a result of multi-vector word-formation acts, is at the same time a subsystem or part of the general structure of a root or etymological nest. We understand the lexical nest as the unity of its etymological and semantic-word-formation structures. The analysis of motivational relations in the lexical nest should begin with the restoration of the original motivated feature, or features of the original lexeme or the original root morpheme. The language nest at various stages of its development represents a formal and semantic unity. All the words included in the structure of the nest reveal formal and semantic similarity, explained by the unity of the cognitive sphere they serve, but there is a limitation imposed by the logic of the internal development of the language, leading to a clash of the principles of derivability vs motivation» [5, p. 6].

### The purpose of the study

The purpose of the study is to isolate the sound-complex  $-g^{\prime}u-$ , its etymological meanings, as well as to determine the typology of semantic transitions, given and motivated by the original form, the analysis of word-formation chains based on the material of the Abkhaz-Adyghe languages.

The modern cognitive approach to the issues of etymology and historical word formation makes it possible to analyze the initial sound-root units within the framework of etymological and word-formation nests, which, in our opinion, is promising in Adyghe studies, because Adyghe root morphemes have a high degree of productivity, which was demonstrated in the monograph of one of the authors of this article devoted to cognitive modeling of etymological nests in multi-system languages based on the material of French and Kabardino-Circassian [6]. The cognitive approach offers ample opportunities in the field of explication of semantic changes, their typology and systematization. We also use techniques of comparative-historical and semantic-motivational methods of analysis.

### The results of the study

The motivation of color lexemes, dating back to prototypical denotations, is most clearly manifested in naive linguistic consciousness, is reflected in mythopoetics and folklore, therefore, it is logical to preface the analysis of color names in the Adyghe worldview with notes on the symbolism of color in the system of Adyghe mythopoetic representations.

The color designations in the Adyghe worldview are filled with deep symbolic meaning and semantic content, representing both the material world and ethnic moral, ethical and aesthetic principles and foundations [7, p. 322]. We can distinguish several concepts in the Adyghe picture of the world in the writer's work in connection with the study of the features of his artistic worldview, and it seems especially relevant on phraseological linguistic material, in which the «spirit of the people» is most clearly manifested [8, p. 195].

Based on the theoretical foundations stated above, we will proceed to the analysis of the root  $-g^{\prime}u-$ , the purpose of which is to determine its formal and meaningful content.

In the «Grammar of the Kabardino-Circassian literary language»  $-g^{\prime}u-$  is considered either as part of a complex root or as a word-forming suffix: *za-my-fe-g^{\prime}u* – «not similar in color; multicolored»; *za-my-gue-g^{\prime}u* «of different pairs» [9, p. 100]; *Gurylue-g^{\prime}ue* «understandable» (ibid., 98). In the words reconstructed by N. R. Ivanokov, the component present in several nominations (*shyg^{\prime}u* «salt», *blag^{\prime}ue* «dragon», etc.)  $-g^{\prime}u-$  is explained by the author as «a sign related to what is called the producing word» [10, p. 163] or «something,

a certain substance, an object» [Ibid., p. 51]. In our opinion, such interpretations of the value of the *-gʷu-* component not only do not reveal its essence, but, on the contrary, further distance it from the solution of the set goal. But it is necessary to pay tribute to the author that he was one of the first to go beyond the existing framework of etymology in Adyghe studies and put forward his view on the reconstruction of many etymons, hydronyms and other nominations.

The well-known Adyghe linguist scientist B. M. Bersirov reveals six meanings of the verb root *-gʷui-* which is a correlate of Kabardino-Circassian *-gʷu-*:

1. «to be, to be together»: *kligʷu*;
2. «add, add something to something»: *shlegʷu*;
3. «to dry, to wilt»: *megʷu*;
4. «to sympathize, to pity, to forgive»: *igy klegʷui*;
5. «to forgive, to be forgiven»: *fegʷuegʷu*;
6. «gnaw»: *yegʷu* [11, p. 28].

In modern Kabardino-Circassian, the component of interest to us *-gʷu-* occurs in the same meanings as above, but as is known, the root is transformed, due to semantic extensions, the appearance of new meanings, which leads to difficulties of varying degrees in reconstruction, during which the archaic meaning is restored.

All the examples in the etymological and semantic analysis provided by the author, in our view, come back to the primary meanings of «dryness» and «close object». In the fourth meaning, according to B. M. Bersirov, *igy klegʷui / igu shlegʷun* in the first part of the second word, apparently meant *shly* «do», and not *shle* «under» and had the meaning «heart to do together / side by side».

In turn, A. K. Shagirov considers the root of *-gʷu-* in the meanings «dry», «to dry out», «crack up» *gʷushlen*, to «dry out» [12, p. 138–141], which confirms our hypothesis about the primacy of this value. The term «dry out» should be interpreted as «dry to the bottom», consisting of the term «dry» *-gʷu-* and the term «bottom» *shly*.

The author sees the meaning of «to forgive» in *-gʷui-* in the verb *gʷun* «to go «unpunished (about injustice, atrocities)». To this root, A. K. Shagirov gives correspondences from the Abkhazian - - *a-gʷuara*, Abaza *gʷuara* «to dry» [Ibid., p. 138].

In our opinion, this root sound is one of the most productive, which underlies several word-formation nests forming a large etymological group or nest, as evidenced by the examples being analyzed in the groups below, united by one of the primary values.

In our opinion, this root sound is one of the most productive, which underlies several word-formation nests forming a large etymological group or nest, as evidenced by the examples analyzed in the groups below, united by one of the primary meanings.

1. The root sound stands out clearly from all the words that are close to the meaning of «that which is not wet, wet»: *gʷui* «dry», *gʷushe* «dry», *gyur* «dried up» [13, p. 105];

2. That which no longer grows, does not develop: *gʷua* - participle from the verb *gʷun* [Ibid., p. 104] (*jyg gʷua*) «not developing, withered tree», *psyr gʷuashch* «water dried up, deadened, there is no movement».

3. An object where there is nothing that should develop, grow: *gʷuegu* «road» [Ibid., p. 101], *lʷagʷue* «path» [Ibid., p. 489].

In the Grammar of the Adyghe language, the word *gʷuegu* is explained as «dry (*gʷui*) surface (*gui*)». A. K. Shagirov disagrees with this formulation of the second part of the word (*gui*), who denies the presence of «surface» here, arguing that *gui* in this sense is combined only with nouns [12, p. 132].

Agreeing with the authors of the Grammar with the interpretation of the meaning of the first part of the word in the form of «something dry», we are not inclined to consider the interpretation of the second part of the nomination *gui* as «surface» given by A. K. Shagirov to be correct. To prove the validity of our solitary point of view, we can cite as an example other lexeme of the modern language: *l'ag'ue* «path» [13, p. 489] (lit. «legs dry») «*l'a* (leg) + *g'ue* (dry, without vegetation) ». It is impossible to separate the second part of this example from the first part of the compound word – *g'uegu* «road» [Ibid., p. 101], where *g'ue/g'ui* «road» and *gu* «arba, cart» [Ibid., p. 67] (lit.: «dry, without vegetation for a cart, cart»). In the examples given, there is a logical, semantic relationship, since there is no vegetation on the trodden «path», «road», nothing multiplies there.

4. Close object/subject: *g'uneg'u* «neighbor» [Ibid., p. 105], «close» *Ieg'ue* «near, close» [Ibid., p. 826]. At first glance, it seems that the semantic structure of these tokens does not contain any common semantic features with the meanings «dried up», «not multiplying». But the first word decomposes into *-g'ui-* in the same meaning as in the words of the third group «to dry up». The second part *-ne-*, which we have highlighted, corresponds to the *-ne-* in the word *une* «house», which will be discussed below, the third part *-g'u-* later received the meaning of the affix of compatibility, i.e. the grammaticalized affix *-g'u-* and in general the word means «neighbor» or «close» – «that there can be nothing, no one closer to you», because the neighbor across the house is no longer your neighbor, but your neighbor's neighbor, so the Adygs say for clarification: *zyune dyakush* «There is one house between us». There is no question of consanguinity here, but only that there cannot be another subject closer to the subject speaking at such a distance. In the lexical system of the Kabardino-Circassian language, the opposition we are considering is represented by the antonymic pair «*blag'e/lyhly* – *hame*» (friend or foe). «*blag'e/lyhly*» (one's own) and «*hame*» (someone else's) «*blag'e/lyhly*» and «*hame*» oppose one another with contrasting meanings [14, p. 99].

In the second word, *Ieg'ue*, two roots stand out: *Ie* «hand» + *g'ue* «near», which takes the meaning «close» in modern Kabardino-Circassian, but contains within itself the meaning «to bring closer what can be reached by hand».

As A. K. Shagirov notes, this root is also represented in other languages of the Abkhaz-Adyghe group: abh. *agluyza*, abaz. *gluza*, ubykh. *glush'e* «companion», «fellow traveler» [12, p. 139]. In the presence of such examples in related languages, we can probably rightfully speak about the archaic nature of this root sound, i.e. the root of *-g'u-* originated in the era of the proto-language: Kabardino-Circassian → Adyghe → Adyg-Ubykh → Adyg-Ubych-Abkhazian → proto-language of the language group.

Color: *g'ue* «light red» [13, p. 100] is a semantic connection between the objectifying color, i. e. that which is no longer «green», «growing», but «dried up» and its «subsequent image». Hence the shades follow: *g'ua+fe* (*g'ua* «light red» + *fe* «image») «light red image», *fa+g'ue* (about a person) (*fe* «color» + *g'ue* «light red») «pale» (lit. «the image is dried up»), a healthy person cannot be completely white, since white is considered the absence of color at all, hence life. In the first example, the polysemous word *fe* in the modern Kabardino-Circassian dialect has exactly the meaning of «image»; other meanings of this word are «skin», «skin», «color», «you» [Ibid., p. 664]. It must be admitted that in the modern language, the component *fe* in compound words, which is read by many in the meaning of «color», does not have such a meaning. For example, in *udzy+fe*, *pl'yzh'y+fe*, *huzh'y+fe*, etc. part *fe* cannot have the meaning of «color», since the semantics of the roots and complex nominations in general negates such a fact: *udz* «grass» + *fe* «image» = «image of grass», *pl'yzh'* «red» + *fe* «image» = «image of something heated», *huzh'* «white» + *fe* «image» =

«image without color/white». To confirm this explanation of the *fe* component, other examples can be given: *psal" a+fe* (*psal" e* «word» + *fe* «image/ manner/style» = image/manner/style of speech. The most voluminous meaning of «image, manner, style» is embodied in the lexeme *shyfel" yfe*, which consists of *shy* «horse» + *fe* «image» + *l" y* «man» + *fe* «image» and translates as «image of a rider».

Hole, nest, hole: *g" ue* «hole» [Ibid., p. 100]; *abg" ue* «nest» [Ibid., p. 19] (something convex above the plane); *g" uane* «hole» [Ibid., p. 100], where *ne* «eye», which collectively matters «withered eye». The «withered eye», according to the Adygs, looks like a hole.

Time, time interval: *ue-g" ue* «to strike time», *guzeveg" ue* is the modern designation of «grief», which was formed by merging *gu* «heart» + *zev* «narrow» + *g" ue* «time», which carries the meaning of «heart narrowing time».

The analysis of the semantic evolution of the sound-the root *g" ue* demonstrates that at some stage of development one of its primary meanings in the process of desemantization turned into a word-formation formant. We observed the loss of proper meaning and the transition to a grammatical affix in the words: *dyg" u* «thief», *g" ude* «gadfly», etc.

To the group of words with the root *-g" u-* that interests us is the nomination «iron» *g" ushl* [Ibid., p. 106]. Being a fossil (not only a rock), iron itself is «something frozen, dried up». Probably, it is not legitimate to say that the nomination was formed in a later era, as evidenced by *g" ui* «something dry/ yellow» + *shly* the «ground», i.e. this is what was found in the ground, and accordingly it was «copper» of the *g" ua+pl" e* (lit. «yellowish-red»). A. K. Shagirov [12, p. 141] also noted that *g" ushl* «iron» is a derivative of *g" ui*, iron. In favor of the proposed version that the *g" uapl" e* «copper» goes back to the *g" u* A. K. Shagirov, correspondences from abh are given. *a-bglva*, abaz. *bglva* [Ibid., p. 131].

In the word *g" um* «fat», A. K. Shagirov believes that for the first component of the word, it is necessary to compare abh. -abaz. *ag" ui/g" ui* «board», ubykh. *g" ui* «pillar» [Ibid., p. 137]. In the same place, the author writes that the second component of the word (*my*) is of the same origin as Ubykh *by* «fat». To develop the scientist's version, one can use the examples *byrtlym* «full, dense» [13, p. 54], the *leshtlym* «fist» [Ibid., p. 834], in which the *m* is the same as in the *g" um* «thick». In this particular case, it is impossible to explain the semantics of the nomination *g" um* «full, dense» without the involvement of language examples identified by A. K. Shagirov in the Ubykh language. If we proceed from the fact that in Ubykh *by* is «thick», and *g" ui* is «pillar», then in Kabardino-Circassian *g" um* should be explained as «thick pillar», the proof of which is the presence in the modern language of the meaning «something thick».

The ubykh *by* would be in the meaning of «thick» correspond to the Adyghe *byrtlym* «thick», *byrybyn* «fluff» [Ibid., p. 54], *beten* «plump» [Ibid., p. 36], *sheryb* «bubble» [Ibid., p. 759], etc., which contain the meaning «something that is higher/larger than the plane». The root preserved in the Ubykh and Adyghe languages testifies not to borrowings from each other, but to its origin in the era of unity of these languages. The Ubykh example *g" uy* «pillar» does not in any way destroy the semantics of the root sound *g" uy* proposed in this article, since, in fact, the «pillar» is also «something dry, not developing, dried up». This meaning of the root indicates once again that none of the dialects of the Adyghe language can be taken as a basis for the etymological and semantic analysis of the word. The Abkhazian-Abaza *ag" uy/g" uy* «board» correspond to the Kabardino-Circassian *g" uy* in *pch" ebg" u* «board» [Ibid., p. 578], which decomposes into *pch" e* «firewood» + *by* «something not narrow» + *g" uy* «dry» and can be interpreted as «wooden wide dry».

It is also impossible not to agree that *-g" ue-* serves to form nouns exclusively from the bases of the verb with a temporal meaning: *lezh" e-g" ue* «working time», *k" uhe-g" ue*

«sunset (sun)» [9, p. 83], which fit into the semantic series in the meaning of «frozen» and data examples are explained as «time is frozen for work» – *lezh"eg"ue*; «time is frozen for setting» – *k"uhe-g"ue*, i.e. there is «time for the accomplishment of these actions and it does not multiply, is not subject to movement».

In the example of *g"uetyn* «to find» [Ibid., p. 103], *g"ue* in the same meaning as in *g"uegu* «road» and in general, the word itself can be explained as «to give/find the road», and its antonym *g"ueshen* «to get lost» [Ibid., p. 104] has the meaning «the road is rotting», that is, «lose the road». Here is the second part (right now) we associate «rot» [Ibid., p. 789] with (*she-shy*) which, in turn, stands out from the «soft» *shabe* [Ibid., p. 771]. The comparison of two opposite words *g"ushyn* «to dry» – *shyn* «to rot», which contains the same element *-shy-* in different meanings and positions, becomes another confirming fact that in the Adyghe languages the sound-root historically comes from the same starting point, developing two opposite meanings (enantiosemy). In the process of the historical development of the language, some of the sound roots lose their productivity, and some are transformed. If initially the element *-shy-* contained the meanings «rot» and «dryness», and the development of the language requires the appearance of new lexemes, the element *-shy-* containing the meaning “dryness” is added to the morpheme *-shy-* containing the meaning «dryness», and in modern Kabardino-Circassian the lexeme *g"ushe* functions to denote «dry».

Thus, in the presence of this element in many nominations *-g"u-* in the Abkhazian, Abaza and Ubykh languages, *g"uabzhe* «dark gray», *g"ue* «burrow», *g"uegu* «road», *g"uezh* «yellow», *g"ueshen* «get lost», *pch"e(m)bg"u* «board», *g"un* «dry», *g"use* «companion» [Ibid., p. 102], we can talk about the semantic community of sound-the root, which has received its further multi-vector development. But it should be pointed out right away that the semantic development of lexemes that go back to a single sound root does not go beyond the semantic limitations set by the original values.

The scope of the article does not allow us to consider all the word-formation nests that form the etymological and lexical nest *g"u* in question. We will focus only on one word-formation nest, which goes back to one of the primary meanings of *g"u*, namely the meaning of «hole», «nest»: *unag"ue* «family», *bynunag"ue* «family with children», *unag"ue ihen* «to enter the family (get married)», *unag"uecle* [13, p. 656] «family name (surname)», *unag"ue zehes* «families sitting together (big family)», *leg"une* «bedroom», *leg"unclykly* «a small room attached to the house with any sides», *leg"unley* «kitchen», *leg"unvak"e* «vintage women's indoor shoes, slippers», *uncledzheg"u* [Ibid., p. 484], «the family name is joint (namesake)». It should be noted that the Adygs in almost all of these nominations often cut down the element of the *g"uy/g"ue*, which does not destroy the integral meaning of what they said. For example, for *unag"ue ihen* «to enter the family (get married)», the full equivalent is *une ihen*; *bynunag"ue* – *bynune* «family with children»; *unag"uecle* – *uncle* «surname», whereas the Adyghe diaspora abroad, in most cases uses *unag"uecle*.

It is noteworthy that in the word *unag"ue* «house» there is already a root morpheme in the meaning of «receptacle» - *ne*, but after the formation of the nomination *y+ne* «house» by merging *u(y)* «man» + *ne* «receptacle» and rooting in the language of this lexical unit, it is formed in the process of language evolution – *unag"ue* with the meaning of «family burrow».

In the course of language development, the sound-root morpheme of *g"ue* in some cases could undergo a process of desamentization, turning into a word-forming affix. The cognitive approach considers the processes of grammatization as a manifestation of a person's cognitive activity, which manifests itself in his ability to conceptualize the world and master more complex, abstract entities through simpler, concrete ones. As E. S. Kubryakova writes,



the naming of concrete objects and concrete actions that have a visual physical nature becomes a source of formation of abstract vocabulary and grammatical units, which also include affixes [15, p. 74]. Based on the above, we can with good reason refer to the lexical nest of the *g"uy* | *g"ue* and the lexeme of the «occasion», referring to the causal vocabulary, where the process of grammatization of the root morpheme into an affix took place.

In the following example, *k"yshueg"eg"u* «forgive me», which consists of five elements: *k"y* – prefix «direction of action» + *-s-* – prefix «first person» + *hue* – prefix «inducement to something» + *g"e* – prefix causative «force» + *g"u* «dry», which ultimately means «directed in my direction, make it dry». In this nomination, the core element is the sound-the root of *g"u*, which, as our research has shown, manifests itself in words that are completely distant from each other in meaning. The entire vocabulary of the Kabardino-Circassian adverb of the Adyghe language with the letter *g"u* has the meaning of «dryness», which in the process of language development has developed to such forms that it is difficult to imagine their relationship in the modern language.

### Conclusions

Despite significant differences in the distribution of meanings, semantic combinations, and word-formation models, a noticeable semantic and formal similarity was found between the studied lexemes. In the presence of this element in many nominations *-g"u-* in the Abkhaz, Abaza and Ubykh languages, *g"uabzhe* «dark gray», *g"ue* «burrow», *g"uegu* «road», *g"uezh* «yellow», *g"ueshen* «get lost», *pch"e(m)bg"u* «board», *g"ushe* «dry», *g"use* «companion» [13, p. 100–105], we can talk about the semantic community of the sound-root, which has received its further multi-vector development. But it should be pointed out right away that the semantic development of lexemes ascending to a single sound root does not go beyond the semantic framework set by the original values.

The presence of numerous identical word-formation models and semantic meanings does not allow them to be considered random. This fact is not explained solely by genetic kinship or language contacts. The typology and hierarchy of motivational features underlying the nomination is explained by the commonality of the laws of thinking, manifested in the similarity of semantic transitions at the language level. The analysis of the nest of words going back to the sound root of the *g"u*, lexical units, their components and their etymons showed that these lexico-semantic groups represent systems at two levels: word-formation and semantic. The article analyzes the semantic structures of single-root words, during which the motivational relationships connecting them are revealed and the main vectors of their semantic evolution are determined, which helps to clarify the nature of the entire system.

The basic meaning, out of the seven semantic and one word-formation meanings of the original word that we have identified, is the starting point for the appearance of a certain set of figurative meanings. Thus, the internal form of the original word, root, root morpheme is the basis for the creation of a new lexical unit. Motivational relationships linking the same-root words are the basis of word-formation chains. The whole complex of the analyzed single-root words reflects the specifics of the division of reality by the peoples speaking the Abkhaz-Adyghe languages.

The methodology of comparative historical analysis applied in the work can be used in the analysis of other sound-root complexes of the Abkhaz-Adyghe languages and has great prospects for further research.

In our study, we limited ourselves to only one root monosyllabic group *-gu-*. The main meaning of the root morpheme remains invariant in various positions within the derived

word. The presence of this element in the examples of different parts of speech indicates its hyper productivity in the Adyghe languages. Based on the values of the examples, we can say that regardless of the number of affixes adjacent to the root sound, there was no shift in the meaning of the root in verbs, whereas in a number of nouns, in modern Kabardino-Circassian, it is translated to affixal morphemes.

All the diversity of the semantic evolution of derivational acts, its multi-vector development is the result of the cognitive activity of a person who, in the process of cognition of reality, names its segments, giving them different characteristics and assessments.

## Ссылки

1. Trubachev O. N. Etymological research and lexical semantics // Principles and methods of semantic research. M., 1976. P. 147–180.
2. Makovsky M. M. Comparative dictionary of mythological symbolism in Indo-European languages. The image of the world and the worlds of images. M.: Vlados, 1996. 416 p.
3. Kardanov M. L. Generic and non-generic affiliation of the nominations of the lexical and semantic group «pse ZYUT Schiyueps» – «wildlife» – Kabardino-Circassian language // Questions of Caucasian philology. Nalchik: FGBUN IGI KBNTS RAS, 2013. № 9. P. 175–178.
4. Voronin S. V. Fundamentals of phonosemantics. L.: Publishing House of Leningrad University, 1982. 244 p.
5. Shomakhova M. H. Typology of motivational semantic models in lexical nests (Based on the material of the Russian and Kabardino-Circassian languages). Abstract of the dissertation for the degree. Degrees of Candidate of Philology Sciences. Vladikavkaz, 2012. 22 p.
6. Kharaeva L. H. Cognitive modeling of etymological nests in multi-system languages (based on the material of French and Kabardino-Circassian languages). Nalchik: El-Fa, 2007. 238 p.
7. Ezaova M. Yu., Kardanov M. L., Shugusheva D. H. The development of the linguistic and linguistic color picture of the world in the Adyghe linguoculture // Social'nye i gumanitarnye znania. 2022. Vol. 8. № 3 (31). P. 320–333.
8. Shugusheva D. H. Phraseological representation of the concept of gu (heart) in the works of A. P. Keshokov // Philological sciences. Questions of theory and practice. Tambov: Gramota. 2017. P. 194–197.
9. Grammar of the Kabardino-Circassian literary language. M.: Nauka, 1970. 216 p.
10. Ivanokov N. R. Selected works. Etymological analysis of some Adyghe (Circassian) words. Nalchik: Publishing house of M. T. V. Kotlyarov, 2015. 360 p.
11. Bersirov B. M. Structure and history of verb bases in the Adyghe languages. Maykop: GURIPPE «Adygea», 2001. 236 p.
12. Shagirov A. K. Etymological dictionary of Adyghe (Circassian) languages. T. I. T. 2. M.: Nauka, 1977. 292 p.
13. Dictionary of the Kabardino-Circassian language / IGI KBNTS RAS, I ed. M.: Digora, 1999. 860 p.
14. Ezaova M. Yu. Linguistic cultural codes in the lexico-semantic field of kinship of the Kabardino-Circassian language // Philological Sciences. Questions of theory and practice. 2017. № 11-3 (77). P. 98–101.
15. Kubryakova E. S. Language and knowledge: On the way to gaining knowledge about language: Parts of speech from a cognitive point of view. The role of language in the knowledge of the world. M.: Languages of Slavic culture, 2004. 560 p.