

(в русском переводе: «Так говорят в Америке, – объяснил Мартин. – «На кой?» значит «На кой хр...? Они там, за океаном, все так спешат, что у них нет времени на то, чтобы договорить слово «хр...». [3, с. 34]).

Проанализировав речь Мартина, мы можем сделать вывод, что Ник Хорнби тщательно проработал этот образ, создал его разносторонним и глубоким. С одной стороны, речь Мартина изобилует сленговыми выражениями со сниженной стилистической окраской, но с другой стороны, он свободно владеет и сложными научными терминами, и иностранными словами, при необходимости использует обценную лексику, может также наполнить свои высказывания юмором и иронией. Мартина можно назвать интеллектуальным человеком, имеющим большой жизненный опыт. Его характер неоднозначен и многогранен, как и его речь. Он совершил ошибку в жизни, и сам осознает это. Его речевая манера отличается живостью и сближает его с читателями. Анализ речевого портрета Мартина помогает лучше понять индивидуальный характер героя и дает наглядное представление о мастерстве писателя.

### *Литература*

1. Виноградов В. В. Избранные труды. Т. 5. О языке художественной прозы. М.: Наука, 1980. 263 с.
2. Караулов Ю. Н. Русский язык и языковая личность. М., 2010.
3. Хорнби Н. Долгое падение. СПб.: Амфора, 2006.
4. Nick Hornby. A Long Way Down. Penguin Books, 2006.

УДК 811.133.1'373

*A. E. Buzheninov (Yekaterinburg, Russia)  
Ural State University of Railway Transport*

## **Architectural metaphor in anatomical terminology in Russian and French**

В статье представлены результаты сопоставительного анализа функционирования архитектурной метафоры в анатомической терминологии в русском и французском языках. В рамках концептуально-семантического анализа выявляются основные когнитивные модели метафорического терминообразования в исследуемых языках, базовые архитектурные понятия, на основе которых формируются анатомические термины-метафоры. Показывается, что терминологическая картина мира специалиста не только тесным образом связана со специальным архитектурным знанием, но и взаимодействует с обыденным знанием.

**Ключевые слова:** терминологическая метафора, концептуализация, анатомический дискурс, архитектурная метафора, термин, метафорическое терминообразование

This article presents the results of a comparative analysis of the functioning of the architectural metaphor in anatomical terminology in Russian and French. Based on the conceptual-semantic analysis, the main cognitive models of metaphorical term formation in the studied languages, basic architectural concepts, on the basis of which anatomical terms-metaphors are formed, are identified. It is shown that the specialist's terminological picture of the world is closely connected not only with special architectural knowledge, but also interacts with common knowledge.

**Keywords:** terminological metaphor, conceptualization, anatomical discourse, architectural metaphor, term, metaphorical term formation

## **1. Introduction**

Metaphor, as one of the most important cognitive mechanisms of cognition and conceptualization of reality, is one of the most relevant areas of research in modern linguistics. The study of the role and status of metaphor in terminological systems, in particular from the point of view of the theory of term formation, becomes especially curious and significant in the epistemological sense.

From the standpoint of the modern cognitive-discursive paradigm of the science of language, it should be noted that the metaphor performs a heuristic function, the function of discovering new knowledge in scientific discourse.

Moreover, in the process of cognition, metaphor seems inevitable. As Ch. Bally pointed out that we similize abstract concepts to objects of the sensory world, because for us this is the only way to know them and acquaint others with them [8, p. 187]. According to U. Eco, “Metaphor involves a comparison of two initially independent entities, and thus increases knowledge” [9, p. 223].

On the other hand, another important function of metaphor in terminology is that it is an effective way of adapting scientific language to contradictory reality. As S. Pinker writes, “And the methodical use of metaphor in science shows that metaphor is a way of adapting language to reality, not the other way around, and that it can capture genuine laws in the world, not just project comfortable images onto it” [13, p. 259].

The exceptional heuristic potential of metaphor is due to the fact that it is based on the fundamental mechanism of analogy. And since “any figures of the world can approach each other through analogy” [10, p. 37], the study of metaphor in terminology makes it possible to reveal figurative ways of conceptualizing certain objects and phenomena in various scientific fields.

## **2. Architectural metaphor as a conceptual structure**

In this work we turn to the comparative analysis of the architectural metaphor in the anatomical terminology of the Russian and French languages. Despite the fact that in science the conceptual isomorphism between the terminological systems of different languages is usually postulated, it should be recognized that metaphorical terms seem to be precisely the area of research that promises to reveal qualitative typological differences in different languages.

The main methods of this study were the method of comparison, description, the method of conceptual-semantic analysis, as well as the method of component and definitional analysis.

In a special study by M.A. Simonenko [7], this phenomenon is understood as “a phrase formed by a word (or a group of words) from the literary language and a lexeme (lexemes) of the professional discourse of architects” [ibid, p. 3]. The paper considers a metaphor that functions in the literary language (*the temple of the soul, the foundation of society*) and in architectural discourse (*the plasticity of concrete, the heart of the complex*) [ibid.]. For us, this definition is not suitable. First, we consider the architectural metaphor in a specialized (anatomical) discourse. Secondly, in such examples as *the plasticity of concrete*, the metaphor is presented not in the architectural term itself (it is taken in a direct, terminological sense), but in a general literary lexeme.

In this paper, we will understand the architectural metaphor as a metaphorical term of a particular scientific or professional field, based on the metaphorical use of the architectural term. At the same time, it should be noted that a term metaphorically rethought as an architectural term (concept) is a product of the verbalization of a special, metaphorical mental structure: a concept containing features determined by the original scientific sphere and features introduced by architectural knowledge.

Comparison of a person and his/her morphology with an architectural object is based on the principle of structurality: both an architectural object and a human body consist of parts and elements. It can be assumed that the previous stage of such an understanding is the metaphor of a mechanism: the image of a person as a complex machine (T. Hobbes, R. Descartes, Leibniz, J.-J. Rousseau, etc.) [4, p. 158–177]. Unlike a mechanism, an architectural structure has a static aspect. It seems not surprising that the architectural metaphor (architecture as a source sphere, in terms of J. Lakoff and M. Johnson) is a fertile field for the conceptualization of anatomical objects. The human body is in many ways similar to an architectural structure as a majestic ensemble with many structural elements. Rene Descartes wrote: “I suppose that the Body is nothing but a certain statue or machine...” [5, p. 6]. Descartes compares a person with various types of mechanisms: grottoes, fountains, clocks, automata, and even with a church organ: “the heart and arteries that animal spirits move in the brain cavities of our machine are like the bellows of these organs, pushing air into the air pipes” [ibid. , p. 64].

### **3. Comparison of the functioning of architectural metaphors in the anatomical terminology of Russian and French**

In a comparative interlingual aspect, our analysis showed that anatomical terms with the source metaphor “*architecture*” are built according to a single cognitive model: *architectural element (term) + anatomical term*. Such a model can be interpreted as a mental structure formed as a result of the process of transterminologization: the term of one area (architecture) is borrowed by another area (anatomy) and

takes on a different meaning from the original one. However, the features inherent in the original meaning affect the perception of the resulting metaphorical term.

So, for example, the metaphorical term *дуга сухожильная* (local thickening of the fascia, usually located above the neurovascular bundle) allows to create the image-scheme of the thickening in the form of an arc. Cf. in French: *arcade sourcilière* (brow bone) – «est dans l'anatomie des Primates, une protubérance osseuse située sur l'os frontal au-dessus de l'orbite de l'oeil» [14, p. 24].

In terms of the modern cognitive-discursive paradigm, such a mechanism for transferring a certain representation from one sphere to another in order to obtain new knowledge is called conceptual integration [6], [11], [12].

In the Russian terminology of anatomy, the main basic architectural terms are **канал, дуга, обвод, пирамида, лабиринт, свод**.

*Канал запираемый* – ограничен запирающей бороздой лобковой кости, запирающей мембраной и приводящими мышцами, пропускает на бедро запираемые сосуды и нерв [2, p. 49].

*Канал лучевого нерва* – плечемышечный канал, который лежит на задней поверхности плеча, между плечевой костью и трехглавой мышцей плеча на протяжении борозды лучевого нерва [Ibid.].

Here the metaphor is based on the similarity in form: like the canal, the corresponding organ has walls, it is elongated, has a length.

*Решетчатый лабиринт* – совокупность ячеек решетчатой кости, сообщающихся между собой и с полостью носа [1].

*Перепончатый лабиринт* – система сообщающихся полостей и каналов с соединительнотканной стенкой, расположенных в костном лабиринте; включает эллиптический и сферический мешочки, три перепончатых полукружных протока и улитковый проток [ibid].

The labyrinth as an architectural structure is a structure consisting of intricate paths to the exit (or leading to a dead end). The labyrinth metaphor is based on a set of features common with the corresponding organ: the presence of cells (grids), the presence of walls, depressions, passages.

As for the basic architectural component of *пирамида*, here the cognitive model is presented as an organ (part of an organ) + an adjective from the term *пирамида*: *пирамидальный отросток, мышца пирамидальная*.

In French anatomical terminology, there are numerous metaphor terms based on the basic architectural term **voûte** (vault) and **arcade** (arch):

*Voûte plantaire* – l'ensemble des courbures concaves que présente la surface inférieure du pied: une courbure longitudinale (allant du calcaneum à la tête des métatarsiens) et une courbure transversale (maximale à la base des métatarsiens) [14, p. 543].

*Arcade dentaire* – organe en forme d'arc, compose de dents. Situées sur le bord des maxillaires chez l'homme, on y retrouve les incisives, les canines, les premolaires et les molaires [ibid., p. 11].

Thus, a set of teeth is called an arch of teeth (as it was mentioned above, in Russian this concept is also expressed by an architectural metaphor – *зубная дуга*), the term *voûte plantaire* coincides with the Russian term *свод стопы*. The metaphor here is also based on the similarity of form (*courbure* – bend, *en forme d'arc* – In the form of an arch). We also note that if the word *arc* (arch) is present in French, the term *arcade* (arch, vault) is used in anatomical terminology: the term *arc* has a different meaning – a bow (weapon for shooting), which, however, also refers us to the sign of the curved shape.

It is to be noted that the discrepancy between languages, as expected, is found not in content (there is a conceptual isomorphism inherent in terminological systems), but in form, in verbalization, which is due to the typological features of the languages themselves. As we can see, in French, unlike Russian, the N + A syntactic model is used, while the Russian language prefers the N + N2 construction.

Such architectural elements as **colonne** (column, pillar) – *colonne vertebrale* (vertebral column); **coupole** (dome, arch) – *coupole pleurale* (dome of the pleura); **tunnel** (tunnel) – *tunnel sous-mouquex* (submucosal tunnel) are also being rethought.

We also note a few cases of interlingual discrepancies at the level of content. So, in French, such an architectural element as **vestibule** (entrance, hall) is rethought and metaphorically used. Thus, *vestibule vaginal* is designated in the Russian-language anatomical terminological system as the *преддверие влагалища*, thus based not on the architectural element (vestibule), but on the commonly used, non-terminological lexeme *преддверие* (although the vestibule in sense is a hall).

Another feature of French anatomical terminology is the use of the "double metaphor". Thus, the term *pavillon de la trompe* is based on two metaphors at once: *pavillon* (pavilion, extension to the house, outbuilding) and *trompe* (channel, pipe). The Russian term corresponding to it, *отверстие евстахиевой трубы*, is also based on the common literary lexeme *отверстие*, and the image of a pavilion, an attached house is erased, leaving only the general sign "hollow inside".

Such phenomena can be explained by the general tendency of the French language towards figurative nomination in comparison with the Russian language. The former is characterized to a greater extent by denominative nomination, while the latter is characterized by verbal nomination [3]. On the other hand, reliance on ordinary knowledge in the course of conceptualization of a special (anatomical) object indicates the close interaction of scientific and ordinary types of knowledge in the formation of a scientific picture of the world of a specialist.

However, interlingual discrepancies at the level of term semantics are the exception rather than the rule.

#### 4. Conclusion

1. In both Russian and French, the architectural metaphor is a productive source of term formation in anatomical terminology. It allows to conceptualize certain anatomical objects based on the similarity of the shape of an organ (or part of an organ) and an architectural object. The formation of such a metaphor is due to the mechanism of conceptual integration.

2. In both Russian and French in anatomical terminology, metaphor terms based on such architectural terms (and concepts verbalized by them) as a *coupole* (купол), *voûte* (свод), *arcade* (арка), *pyramide* (пирамида) (pyramide), *tunnel* (туннель), etc. Due to the well-known internationality of the scientific picture of the world, a high degree of isomorphism can be traced in the studied languages.

3. Interlingual differences in the metaphorical nomination of anatomical terms are determined by the typological differences in the studied languages. This also applies to cognitive models (N + N2 in Russian, N + A in French), as well as particular differences in the functioning of architectural metaphors.

4. The productivity of metaphorical term formation (architectural metaphor) and the use of rethought common, non-terminological lexemes indicates the close interaction of different types of knowledge: for the conceptualization of anatomical objects, both special knowledge (the field of architecture) and everyday knowledge are actively involved. The prospect of this study may be an attempt to identify other areas-sources of metaphors in anatomical terminology, both at the level of one language and in a comparative aspect.

#### References

1. БМС – Большой медицинский словарь [Электронный ресурс]. URL: [http://gufo.me/bigmedslov\\_a#abc](http://gufo.me/bigmedslov_a#abc) (дата обращения: 18.01.2022).
2. Борисевич А. И. и др. Словарь терминов и понятий по анатомии человека. М.: Высш. шк., 1990. 272 с.
3. Гак В. Г. Сравнительная типология французского и русского языков. М.: Либроком, 2010. 288 с.
4. Глебкин В. В. Смена парадигм в лингвистической семантике. От изоляционизма к социокультурным моделям. М.; СПб.: Центр гуманитарных инициатив, 2014. 368 с.
5. Декарт Р. Человек. М.: Праксис, 2012. 128 с.
6. Исаева Е. В., Мишланова С. Л. Метафорическое моделирование разных типов знания в дискурсе компьютерной безопасности. Пермь: Перм. гос. нац. исслед. ун-т, 2014. 171 с.
7. Симоненко М. А. Архитектурная метафора в языке и речи: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Курск, 2009. 24 с.
8. Bally Ch. *Traité de stylistique française*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1950. 331 p.

9. Eco U. De l'arbre au labyrinthe. Etudes historiques sur le signe et l'interprétation. Paris: Editions Grasset et Fasquelle, 2011. 836 p.
10. Fauconnier G., Turner M. The way we think: conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities. New York: Basic work, 2002. 440 p.
11. Foucault M. Les mots et les choses. Paris: Gallimard, 2012. 406 p.
12. Oliveira I. La métaphore terminologique sous un angle cognitive [Электронный ресурс] // Méta. Montréal: Les presses de l'université de Montréal, 2005. URL: [tp://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2005/v50/n4/019923ar.pdf](http://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2005/v50/n4/019923ar.pdf) (дата обращения: 18.01.2022).
13. Pinker S. The stuff of Thoughts. Language as a Window into Human Nature. London: Penguin books. 2007. 499 p.
14. Thiele C. Anatomie et physiopathologie humaines de poche. Bruxelles: Editions De Boeck, 2010. 712 p.

УДК 81

*Е. С. Бульбенко (Волгоград, Россия)  
Волгоградская академия МВД России*

### **Английские заимствования в массмедийной коммуникации**

Предметом рассмотрения являются английские заимствования в современных СМИ. Выявляются основные сферы, в которых функционируют англицизмы; определяется доминирующая сфера объективации английских заимствований.

**Ключевые слова:** англицизм, заимствования, политическая сфера, СМИ, массмедийная коммуникация

Не вызывает сомнения тот факт, что коммуникативное поведение homo sentiens требует, чтобы в языке постоянно появлялись новые слова или словосочетания, провоцирующие его на новое отображение того или иного феномена, явления, понятия, термина или значения.

Существуют определенные причины, способствующие заимствованию: а) заимствование номинантов новых явлений; б) принятие этих явлений в другую лингвокультуру; в) заимствование новейших понятий вместе с возникновением иноязычных новинок в сфере экономики и научно-технического прогресса; г) необходимость выделить определенную характеристику конкретного предмета; д) нейтрализация уже закрепившихся коннотаций слов с отрицательной окраской в родном языке; е) следование модным тенденциям употребления того или иного англицизма.

Заимствования, проникая в любой язык и его культуру, автоматически переносят в себе определенный культурный код. По мнению В. А. Буряковской, трансляция чужого культурного кода – это перенос основных ассоциативных