

II. LINGUISTIC CONFLUENCES

THE PLACE OF THE ANATOMICAL METAPHOR IN ROMANIAN DIALECT VARIANTS

Cosmin CĂPRIOARĂ
„Ovidius” University from Constanța
ct.caprioara@yahoo.fr

Abstract:

This study aims at highlighting some of the most important findings and observations resulting from some extensive research on metaphorical anatomical terms in folk Romanian language, as reflected on the dialect maps in the ALRR. *Sinteză* and other Romanian linguistic atlases, including those dealing with South-Danube Romanian dialects. The methodological and theoretical considerations regarding the folk metaphor, which has become a form of catachresis through daily use, and the lexico-semantic field of human body parts, similar, in many respects, to a terminology, are complemented by observations on how the metaphORIZATION process actually occurs within this lexical subset.

Key words:

Linguistic geography, Romanian dialect variants, folk anatomical metaphor, catachresis, the lexico-semantic field of human body parts.

1. Premises

The progress achieved in lexicography and linguistic geography in the last decades has entailed many linguistic onomasiological contributions related to human body parts (among them are Iordan 1940, Saramandu 2008, *craniul* ‘skull’; Tagliavini 1949, Caprini, Ronzitti 2007, Koch 2008, Juliá Luna 2009, Cruz Ortis 2018, *ochiul* ‘eye’, mainly *pupila* ‘pupil’; Livescu 1977-2003, *capul* ‘head’, *uvula* ‘uvula’ etc.; Morcov 2020, *uvula*; Milică

2017, *mărul lui Adam* ‘Adam’s apple’; Cazacu 1941, *ficatul și plămâni* ‘liver and lungs’; Ulivi 1969, *rotula* ‘kneecap’; Zauner 1903, human body parts in Romance languages; Ernout 1957, human anatomy in Latin; Felecan 2005, 2005a, human body in Romanian and from a Romance perspective; Frățilă 2002-2016, human body in South-Danube Romanian dialects and so on).

Furthermore, we have recently finalised a study¹ which deals with the metaphorization process in the field of folk and regional terms designating human body parts, recorded on the maps of Romanian dialect atlases and in other dialect-related works. This work illustrates our concerns for the discovery and understanding of the specific manner in which the Romanian language is organised and functions, particularly in terms of diatopic variation. It consists of two parts, one which focuses on the creation of an inventory of metaphorical terms referring to human body parts based on the “products” of linguistic geography, and one which deals with the classification of these metaphorical terms according to several lexico-semantic and grammatical criteria. It is, therefore, an interdisciplinary attempt that resorts to the tools and methods of other linguistic branches, such as dialectology, linguistic geography, stylistics, motivational linguistics, lexicology, semantics, language history, comparative linguistics, ethnolinguistics, psycholinguistics etc. Thus, we have analysed the process of metaphorization which involved numerous Romanian terms designating body parts and we have examined the involvement and importance of using linguistic geography in highlighting the expressive set of human anatomical names, starting from dialect atlases and identifying the way in which metaphorization covers the known linguistic areas.

2. Objectives

Our main objectives were to identify, in the studied dialectal material, the anatomical terms with metaphorical values, to present the distribution of forms through minimal geographic indications, to order the metaphorical anatomical terms according to several criteria and to discuss the situations

¹ *Denumiri metaforice ale părților corpului omenesc în româna populară*, to be published.

which may be of interest from different perspectives. We have grouped the terms and observations according to *tertium comparationis*, i.e., the seme(s) at the centre of the semantic transfer, using the tools of motivational linguistics. We have considered the metaphorical anatomical terms as being *expressive*², from a stylistic perspective, and *justified*, i.e., having a transparent justification from a semantic point of view³. Their emergence is made possible by the permanent human need to express imagination, expressiveness and affectivity, and their justified nature is related directly or through intermediate links to the semes or some fundamental semes of basic denotative meaning.

3. Methodology

Our research considers all Romanian diatopic variants and has been carried out based mainly on the first two volumes of the *Atlas lingvistic român pe regiuni. Sinteză* (ALRR. *Sinteză*), which gathers and organises the information from all Romanian regional atlases. We have also used the volumes about body parts of the *Atlas lingvistic român*, part one (ALR I/I, ALR I/II) and part two (ALR II/I). As regards the South-Danube Romanian dialects, we have resorted to relatively recent atlases, especially Nicolae Saramandu's *Atlasul lingvistic al dialectului aromân* (ALAR) and, to a lesser extent, Petar Atanasov's *Atlasul lingvistic al dialectului meglenoromân* (ALDM) and Radu Flora's *Micul atlas lingvistic al graiurilor istroromâne* (MALGI).

In terms of meanings and etymology and in order to complete the inventory of metaphorical anatomical terms, we have relied on the present dictionaries of the Romanian language, mainly DA/DLR, MDA, DER, DEX, DDA and DGDS, correlating these data, as much as possible, with the information provided by the analysed atlases. Moreover, we have completed the set of sources with numerous articles, studies and works dealing with the anatomical vocabulary and metaphor, written by Romanian and foreign researchers.

² V. Iordan, 1940.

³ Cf. Saramandu, 2008, p. 18 sqq.

We have conducted a thorough research by classifying the metaphorical terms identified and selected from the dialect material according to several criteria: based on the semantic transfer, on elements from the surrounding universe they relate to, on the lexical and grammatical structure or etymology. We have deemed that such a perspective may lead us to not only pertinent, but also accurate observations on the investigated linguistic phenomenon.

By giving the anatomical metaphor a wide meaning and an extension, which often includes metonymy and synecdoche and which juxtaposes several aspects of regional (diatopic) and social (diastratic) variation from synchrony and less from diachrony, we have obtained a picture of the process of metaphorization that occurred in this important field of reality as well as an inventory of expressive terms regarded from multiple perspectives.

4. Metaphor. Clarifications

Interest in metaphor dates back from the Antiquity and the related bibliography is highly comprehensive, for “autant de théories linguistiques autant de conceptions de la métaphore”⁴. This interest is natural, given the circulation of metaphor in everyday speech and the fact that our basic conceptual system is of metaphorical nature⁵. In other words, we understand reality through metaphors because our conceptual system is metaphorically structured. In fact, some philosophers, such as the British John Locke, believed that metaphor is at the very origin of language and myth⁶.

Metaphors in everyday speech illustrate a way of thinking or perceiving a given reality, influenced by the experience or culture we live in⁷. They are in no way “a disease of language”, as it was believed at the beginning of linguistic mythology,

⁴ R. Martin, *apud* Cristea, 2001, 74.

⁵ V. Lakoff, Johnson, 1980.

⁶ *Apud* Bârlea, 2022, p. 42, cf. *idem*, 2021, p. 14.

⁷ Cf. M. Black’s assertion in the 1972 article “More about metaphor” (*apud* Eco 1996, 166): “Some metaphors enable us to see aspects of reality that the metaphor’s production helps to constitute. But that is no longer surprising if one believes that the world is necessarily a world under a certain description - or a world seen from a certain perspective.”

“but, on the contrary, a productive means of enriching the language first and foremost on a semantic level and secondly, on a lexical level, in phraseological structures and, ultimately, in the entire language system”⁸.

Noting the systematic character of metaphors, mainly of the lexicalised ones, T. Cristea states:

“Cette systématique se manifeste par la création de noyaux figuratifs autour de certains éléments qui conceptualisent notre expérience. Le même trait figuratif est transmis à l’ensemble linguistique, ou onomasiologique.”⁹

In addition to metaphor, this systematisation is also felt in the case of metonymy and synecdoche, because all three of them occur through common operations of “figurativization” (Fr. *figurativisation*), as B. Pottier puts it, although metonymy relies on connections between referents, such as *a vedea* ‘see’, whereas metaphor relies on mental, conceptual associations, in the sphere of *a(-și) imagina* ‘imagine’, and synecdoche is based on inclusion¹⁰.

In fact, the traditional rhetorical conception, in which emphasis was laid on the specificity of tropes, has been lately countered by interpretations which exhibit a tendency to “even” them¹¹, for the purpose of grouping metaphor and synecdoche (P. Ricoeur), metaphor and metonymy (A. J. Greimas and J. Courtés) or metonymy and synecdoche (G. Kleiber).

The mechanism of metaphorical “figurativization”, based on analogy and semantic transfer (therefore, on a “resemblance, however small or remote that may be”, between two objects¹²), may be summed up as *A is the equivalent of B*, i.e., the former replaces the latter in a certain context and, consequently, within a certain lexical subset¹³.

In this case, B is a term from the anatomical vocabulary denoting a part of the body or an organ for which the folk imagination has established a relationship of analogy and semantic transfer, contiguity or inclusion, based

⁸ Bârlea, 2022, p. 48.

⁹ Cristea, 2001, p. 82.

¹⁰ Cf. Cristea, 2001, p. 71, 92.

¹¹ Cf. Cristea, 2001, pp. 92-93.

¹² Coteanu, Forăscu, Bidu-Vrânceanu, 1985, p. 55.

¹³ Cf. Eco, 1996, p. 166: “*Metaphor does not establish a similarity relationship between referents, but a semic identity between the contents of expressions and the only manner in which one considers the referents is mediated.*”

on more or less obvious common features, with another element of reality, known as A. The resemblance between A and B relies on that set of features that are common to both objects (in a broad sense), which is called the *middle term of the metaphor, tertium comparationis* or *metasememe*. The transfer of names that the metaphor implies, the emergence of new meanings actually, by means of which other objects are designated, to already existing words is possible precisely due to speakers' "intuiting" the presence of this element, in other words, due to the "*semantic, partially common content of the substituted element and of the substituting one*" (DSL, s.v. *metaforă*)¹⁴.

Once the metaphor is produced, the speaker will not confuse the two objects engaged in this mechanism, especially as its very emergence is based on the simultaneous existence of the names of the two objects:

*"To determine whether or not a word is a metaphor, that word needs to be used with its own, literal meaning or the meaning considered as such. It must keep its ability to denote the object underlying the analogy. [...] On the synchronic level of the language, there is thus no metaphorical meaning if there is no literal one, for metaphor relies on the general literal-figurative opposition, valid for any trope"*¹⁵

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), there are two levels of manifestation, hence, of analysis of metaphor: a deep or *conceptual* level, consisting of *conceptual metaphors* resulting from ontological and epistemic correspondences between the two consecutive domains of metaphor, and a surface or *linguistic* level, of *linguistic metaphors*, which is actually the linguistic materialisation of the former, implying that metaphor is not only a figure of speech, but also a figure of thought¹⁶. Therefore, the meaning of metaphor can be sought from the linguistic level towards the conceptual one.

¹⁴ In other words, "*the essence of metaphor consists in analogy and semantic transfer*" (Corniță, 1995, p. 168), whereas Aristotle, who provided one of the first definitions of metaphor as "*the application of a strange term either transferred from the genus and applied to the species or from the species and applied to the genus, or from one species to another or else by analogy*", believed that "*to make beautiful metaphors is to know how to see the similarities between things*" (*apud* Corniță, *loc. cit.*).

¹⁵ Coteanu, Forăscu, Bidu-Vrănceanu, 1985, p. 56.

¹⁶ Cf. Vrămuleț, 2012, p. 62.

Over time, there have been two currents in the interpretation of the origin of metaphor: a linguistic current, which concerns the analogical transfer in lexical terms, and a cognitivist one, which claims that metaphor is the fruit of analogy between certain conceptual spheres, an “issuing” one, the *source*, and a “recipient”, i.e., the *target*¹⁷.

The German researchers P. Koch and A. Blank¹⁸ believe that, before being named, a concept (*target concept*) is analysed by speakers and its dominant trait, associated with an existing word (*source form*), serves as base (*source concept*) to form the new denomination (*target form*). During the mental analysis, certain associative relationships (of similarity, contiguity and contrast) are established between the source concept and the target concept. Metaphorical similarity is placed within the similarity relations, alongside taxonomic subordination, taxonomic superordination etc.

5. Anatomical metaphor

As expected, anatomical metaphors are nominal metaphors and are largely forms of catachresis, hence, “hardened” or “blunt” metaphors whose expressive value is no longer felt as such by the speakers¹⁹. However, among them there are also creations, sometimes isolated, which carry a large stylistic load. Of these, one may be more expressive than the other(s). In this respect, for instance, the metaphors which designate the pupil, Adam’s apple or the kneecap occupy leading positions.

Obviously, the main source of metaphor, in general, and of anatomical metaphor, in particular, is the current language²⁰ and only some of the names of body parts can be analysed in terms of a semantic metaphorical change that should actually regard the evolution of the Romanian language²¹. We are

¹⁷ Cf. Vrămuleț, 2021, p. 363.

¹⁸ *Apud* Popovschi, 2014-2015, p. 59.

¹⁹ U. Eco (1996, pp. 163-164) would state in relation to this matter: “...one must approach a metaphor or a metaphorical statement starting from the principle that there is a **zero degree** (author’s emphasis) of language – in relation to which even the dullest catachresis proves to be a fortunate deviation. The fact that a metaphor is dead concerns its sociolinguistic history, not its semiotic structure: its genesis and its possible reinterpretation.”

²⁰ Slave, 1986, p. 160. Cf. Șăineanu, 1999, p. 148 sqq.

²¹ Cf. Pașca, 1927-1928, p. 277.

referring to the simple, derived or compound names which, by means of a morphosyntactic device (attribution of a determiner) or of a semantic one (extension of meaning, narrowing of meaning, semantic transfer etc.), acquired an anatomical meaning at some point.

In this case, the recording of terms has allowed for the analysis of the metaphorization process and facilitated the identification of the mechanism of metaphor production, in its very general sense. In most cases, body parts receive denominations by analogy of shape, colour, aspect, arrangement, attributes, function, size etc. with various objects, with anatomical parts of other creatures and, more rarely, with phenomena from the speakers' immediate universe. They are thus integrated both into the "animate for animate" metaphor subtype and into the "inanimate for animate" ones²².

We should also mention that, in establishing the inventory of anatomical names with metaphorical value, we have considered the chronological criterion, according to which the word that, at some point, comes to designate a part of the body due to affectivity, expressiveness and so on, should be *first and foremost* (our emphasis) the name of another element of reality and should evoke,

*"in the listener's mind, both images of the notions, the old, objective (unfigured) one and the new, subjective (motional) one"*²³.

6. Folk anatomical terminology

As a result of their high frequency in everyday communication and, implicitly, of their belonging to the main word-stock, as well as due to their age and stability, anatomical terms occupy a privileged position within the vocabulary of any language. The names of body parts, present in the dialectal varieties of a language, may be considered elements of folk anatomical terminology²⁴.

Linguists have identified and discussed particularly those

²² Cf. Coteanu, Forăscu, Bidu-Vrănceanu, 1985, pp. 56-60.

²³ Pașca, 1927-1928, p. 277, cf. Coteanu, Forăscu, Bidu-Vrănceanu, 1985, pp. 56-57, pp. 63-64.

²⁴ Cf. DSL, s.v. *terminologie*, Vintilă-Rădulescu, 1999, p. 5 sqq., Căprioară, 2014, p. 11 sqq., Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2000, *idem* 2007, p. 18 sqq.

terminologies or folk specialised languages that refer to the fields of artisans, agriculture, cattle breeding, domestic industry, occupations, commerce etc., but there have also been numerous concerns regarding the language of ethnomedicine, religion or politico-social relations.

As in the other cases, here too the existence of a set of terms representing a system of notions in a well-defined field, such as that of human body parts, can be identified as a defining element. It is a folk terminology, i.e., a lexical set within which terminological specialisation occurred spontaneously, naturally, unsystematically²⁵; that is why, specific terms which make up a subset of general Romanian vocabulary do not fully meet the conditions of non-ambiguity and precision, that is, of unequivocalness and monoreferentiality.

Furthermore, the field of the names of body parts is so much a part of everyday human communication that one could hardly accept, in its case, the idea of specialised anatomical language, equivalent to a terminology, defined in the DSL s.v. as

“a set of terms or specialised words belonging to a sociolect, which is characterised by unequivocalness and non-ambiguity”.

Therefore, what we are dealing with is a lexico-semantic field of the common language, which nevertheless comprises a finite number of lexical units, organised in a system and functioning according to a certain hierarchical logic²⁶.

It is true that many (mainly metaphorical) names of body parts are polysemantic (see the cases of *nod*, *ou*, *capac*, *broască*, *melc* etc.) but in all these cases there is also a mechanism of disambiguation based on context, on the situation of communication and their inclusion in fixed or semi-fixed structures lying at the boundary between compounds and free combinations, which excludes any other interpretation.

We should point out that when referring to names of body parts, we have used *term* as a synonym of *word*²⁷, the approach being onomasiological,

²⁵ V. Vintilă-Rădulescu, 1999, p. 7.

²⁶ Cf. Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2008, p. 45 sqq.

²⁷ The term is “a word subject to restrictions” (Bidu-Vrănceanu, 2007, p. 38).

and *terminology* closer to what *lexico-semantic field* designates, namely a set of terms relating to a certain field of reality. So, we have considered that the expressive denominations of body parts form a *metaphorical field*, similar to lexico-semantic fields, which consists of metaphorical micro-fields resulting from the analogies produced by the intersection of several conceptual spheres.

7. Metaphor and anatomical names

Since ancient times, people had looked for similarities among the elements of their surrounding universe and semantically loaded the lexical items of a little evolved language. As human society progressed, language became more complex and grew richer as an inventory. Even in the new conditions, polysemy remained to play an important role, and this was reflected in the field of names of body parts. For example, the resemblance of the skull to an empty clay vessel entailed the use of Lat. *testa* to designate both in the common language, whereas Romance languages changed the metaphor into a denotative meaning (cf. It., Prov., Cat. *testa*, Fr. *tête* ‘head’, Rom. *țeastă*, Sp. *testa* ‘skull’, Pt. *testa* ‘forehead’).

Some inherited Romanian denominations of body parts had undergone a process of metaphorization as early as the Latin language²⁸, usually in the vulgar (and sometimes late) variant of it, such as: *falcă* ‘jaw’ (< Lat. *falx*, *-cis* ‘sickle’), *ficat* ‘liver’ [< Lat. (*iecur*) *ficatum* lit. ‘fig-stuffed (liver)’], through the ‘foie gras’ stage, see TLFi, s.v. *foie*], *geană* ‘eyelash’ (< Lat. *gena* ‘cheek; eyelid’ → ‘eye socket’), *gură* ‘mouth’ (< Lat. *gula* ‘throat, gullet’), *inimă* ‘heart’ (< Lat. *anima* ‘soul’), *măsea* ‘tooth, molar’ (< lat. *maxilla* ‘jawbone’), *piele* ‘skin’ (< Lat. *pellis* ‘animal skin’ and ‘animal fur’), *rost* ‘speech’ (< Lat. *rostrum* ‘beak, snout’), *spată* ‘scapula’ [< Lat. *spatha* ‘blade (in tissue); spade’, v. GDLR], *țeastă* ‘head, skull’ [< Lat. *testa* ‘shell, carapace’ → ‘clay vessel’ → ‘head; skull’, cf. DELL s.v.] etc. Some of these (more specifically *falcă*, *geană*, *măsea* plus *sprânceană* ‘eyebrow’) are “*etymological and semantic ‘unique’ Romanian words which denote those*

²⁸ V. Felecan, 2005, pp. 231-244; cf. Ernout, 1957; Livescu, 2003a; Bădescu, 2019.

particular notions”²⁹. Other literary, neological terms are also based on Latin metaphors, such as: *claviculă* ‘cheiță’ ‘small key’, *pupilă* ‘fetiță’ ‘little girl’, *rotulă* ‘roțiță’ ‘small wheel’, *uvulă*, initially a diminutive of *uva* ‘grape’ and so on.

All these developments presuppose the manifestation of some defining characteristics of the human spirit, namely, the appeal to imagination and expression of affectivity through language. Like I. Iordan³⁰, we also consider that

“any linguistic sign takes on an affective value when it is called upon to perform a new function”.

At the same time, however, as P. G. Bârlea³¹ points out, one must also consider the permanent relationship

*“between **subjective** and **objective** in the verbal designation of reality, an issue which points again (...) to the idea of **comparison** and this latter one, to the idea of **norm** (author’s emphasis).”*

Many anatomical names are metaphorical in origin, both in Dacoromanian and in the South-Danube Romanian dialects, i.e., they are the so-called *etymological metaphors*³², which are usually inherited. With some of them, the semantic transfer is very easy to observe, but sometimes, the limited circulation of some terms, the unawareness of the possible additional meanings, their poor representation at the level of attestations etc. allow highlighting their metaphorical value only after consulting the dictionary.

In many situations, we witness “confusions” made by speakers among the names of anatomical parts, more specifically,

“the translation of meaning from one body part to another, when they are close to each other or are not sufficiently outlined”³³.

These phenomena are not specific only to Romanian and do not occur solely in a certain age, those from Latin, for example, being well-known, with consequences in Romance languages: see, for instance, Lat. *humerus* (Rom.

²⁹ Livescu, 2003a, p. 330.

³⁰ 1940, p. 97.

³¹ 1999, pp. 43-44.

³² Șerban, Evseev, 1978, p. 160.

³³ Felecan, 2005, p. 234; cf. Popovschi, 2014-2015, p. 69.

umăr ‘shoulder’, Sp. *hombro*, Pt. *ombro*) → Lat. *spathula* (It. *spalla*, Fr. *épaule*, Pt. *espádua*) and Lat. *cor*, *-dis* (Cat. *cor*, It. *cuore*, Fr. *coeur*) → Lat. *anima* (Rom. *inimă* ‘heart’)³⁴.

We have also taken these confusions into consideration alongside the situations in which the metaphorical “transfer” occurs only in an idiolect, i.e. in a single speaker, or in the speech of a small number of individuals. They are cases of “metaphorical” hapax, results of individual manifestation of imagination and creativity, which, more often than not, through acceptance by the community, underlie “collective” metaphors³⁵.

Another aspect that we have taken into account has to do with *derived* metaphors, the existence of which “*relies on semantic paradigms that resemble the very broadly conceived synonymic series*”³⁶, and with *reciprocal* metaphors³⁷, both subsumed to *synonymic derivation*. The former category may be illustrated by identifying the human head first with the pumpkin (*dovleac*, or *bostan* in other regions) and then with other fruits of some plants of the same family (*tărtăcuță* ‘gourd’, *tigvă* ‘calabash’ etc.) or other plants that are similar in shape (*ridiche* ‘radish’, *gulie* ‘kohlrabi’ etc.). The latter category is encountered in the case of *mărul lui Adam* ‘the Adam’s apple’, which becomes *mărul gâtului* ‘apple of the throat’ by replacing the second component, then *nodul gâtului* ‘lump of the throat’ or *cucuruzul gâtului* ‘cone of the throat’ by reorienting the image to the first element of the structure.

8. Results

Carried out mainly based on the dialectal material collected from linguistic atlases, this study points out the situation of anatomical metaphors in the contemporary stage of the Romanian language. Some of these are undeniably very old and continue to have great vitality. Others, particularly those present in very small areas or the cases of hapax, on account of their being ad hoc individual creations, probably had an ephemeral existence.

³⁴ Cf. Livescu, 2003a; Sala, 1958.

³⁵ Cf. Sala, 1958, p. 498.

³⁶ Coteanu, Forăscu, Bidu-Vrănceanu, 1985, p. 62.

³⁷ V. Sala, 1961, p. 203 sqq.

Still, even these ones testify to certain forms of thought or specific mechanisms which make it possible for connotation to emerge within this folk terminology.

Our approach required a very comprehensive view of the manifestation of expressivity in folk anatomical terminology, in the sense that *metaphor* includes not only actual metaphors, whether or not lexicalised, but also metonymies and synecdoches.

Some of them may be subject to the process of lexicalisation of tropes, which consists in “*generalising the altered meaning of words that have undergone a metonymy, a synecdoche or a metaphor*”³⁸. These generalised meanings, which are originally figurative or connotative, enter the semantic structure of a word as new meanings³⁹. Consequently, the lexicalised tropes considered (metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche), including those in the field of human anatomy, are integrated into the phenomenon of “natural polysemy”⁴⁰. This aspect is illustrated by *strung* ‘gorge, i.e., throat’, *omușor* ‘uvula’, *măr* ‘apple’ (~*ul lui Adam* ‘the Adam’s apple’), *spată* ‘scapula’, *lingurică* ‘little spoon, i.e., thoracic cavity’, *șiră* (~*a spinării*) ‘spine’, *coș* (~*ul pieptului*) ‘thoracic cavity’, *fluiet* (~*ul piciorului*) ‘shin’, *ou* ‘egg’ (~*l piciorului* ‘egg of the foot, i.e., ankle’) etc.

Still, many anatomical names which have the quality of tropes, i.e., are metaphors, metonymies or synecdoches, are not noted in lexicographic works with those particular meanings, but are recorded on the dialect maps with sometimes large areas of distribution (for example, *clopoțel* ‘bell, i.e. uvula’, *gușter* ‘throat’, *popic* ‘uvula’, *pară* ‘the Adam’s apple’, *dudă* ‘oesophagus’, *lăturoaie* ‘tonsils’, *glugă* ‘wattle, dewlap’, *capac* ‘kneecap’ etc.). If they can fall into the category of lexicalised tropes as well, it is not as certain whether the metaphorical names given as individual answers in a single point of inquiry belong to the “tropes d’invention”, similar to those usually present in cultivated literary creations, which are fruit of the author’s view and are not necessarily “accepted” as such by the community. Although

³⁸ Coteanu, Forăscu, Bidu-Vrănceanu, 1985, p. 63.

³⁹ Cf. Cristea, 2001, p. 93.

⁴⁰ B. Pottier, 1992, p. 40, *apud* Cristea, 2001, p. 70.

the speaker provided an answer that can be considered as “unique” in relation to the entire linguistic area under investigation, that answer may still be interpreted as being shared by at least part of the community he/she belongs to. This aspect is not always certain and verifiable; hence, we may consider that these individual metaphors do not stand next to the lexicalised ones. Either way, one should heed the principle according to which “*the metaphor implies the existence of the proper sense of the word in its semantic content*”⁴¹.

As regards certain, usually smaller body parts, whose shapes and functions stimulate one’s imagination, genuine metaphorical “plethora” may be encountered, as is the case for the skull, pupil, cheekbone, uvula, the Adam’s apple, clavicle, back of the hand, kneecap, ankle and so on. On the other hand, other body parts have no expressive, metaphorical denomination reflected on the maps of dialect atlases. Here we can include the head, the eye as a whole, the ear, nose, mouth and teeth, the tongue, the hand, elbow and arm, the finger, the nail, the ribs etc., and others, such as the nape, the heart, the spleen, the kidneys etc., sporadically bear such names.

Our attempt to fix metaphorical names depending on the diatopic variation, as reflected in the points which make up the dialect network of linguistic atlases, has not only led to the discovery of a denominative pattern, based on semantic transfer, mainly due to the analogy according to shape, function, attributes etc., but has also revealed imaginative leaps within this process, with sometimes surprising results due to their linguistic expressiveness (see *aluniță*, *feciorică* or *fluture*, for ‘pupil’, *hudă*, for ‘nostril’, *bărbățel*, *clopoțel* or *liliac*, for ‘uvula’, *broaște*, *prigorii*, for ‘tonsils’, *cruce*, *furchiță*, *jug*, *punte*, *toartă* for ‘clavicle’, *cucuruz*, *fluier*, for ‘Adam’s apple’, *păienjeneală*, for ‘peritoneum’, *arbore*, for ‘hip’, *gogonică*, *lacăt*, *pălărie*, *prâsnel*, *talger*, for ‘kneecap’, *merișoare*, *nuci*, *tuturigi*, for ‘ankles’ and so on).

Naturally, both types of metaphors used in the field of names of human body parts have been identified. On the one hand, linguistic metaphors

⁴¹ Coteanu, Forăscu, Bidu-Vrănceanu, 1985, p. 57, cf. *ibidem*, pp. 63-64.

(well-worn by long use), such as *lumina ochiului* ‘apple of one’s eye’, *mărul lui Adam* ‘the Adam’s apple’, *spata umărului* ‘shoulder blade’, *capul pieptului* ‘thoracic cavity’, *coșul pieptului* ‘chest cavity’, *furca pieptului* ‘thoracic cavity’, *praporul mațelor* ‘bowel membrane, peritoneum’, *podul palmei* ‘back of the hand’, *fluiorul piciorului* ‘shin’, *ouăle picioarelor* ‘ankles’ etc.; on the other hand, metaphors proper (stylistic metaphors), still full of expressiveness, such as those referring to the head (*cerul capului*, *ciutura capului*), the eye (*ceriul ochiului*, *feciorica ochiului*, *fetița din vedere*, *fluturele ochiului*, *mărgeaua ochiului*, *raza luminii*, *cămașa ochiului*, *plapuma ochiului*, *musteața ochiului*), face parts (*mărul obrazului*, *mărul feței*, *strunga de la nas*, *mr. sămaru di la gură*), throat (*cățelul din gât*, *spicul limbii*, *mărul domnului*, *cocoșul lui Adam*, *nuca gâtului*, *oușorul gâtului*, *para lui Adam*, *pară de gât*), chest and thorax (*furculița pieptului*, *lingurița pieptului*), shoulder (*lopata umărului*, *lopățița umărului*), back and spine (*jgeabul spinării*, *râpa spinării*), hand (*peștele mâinii*), the membrane covering the bowels (*păienjeneala mațelor*), arm and hand (*călcâiul palmei*, *mărul de la mână*, *roata palmei*, *talpa palmei*, *umărul palmei*), foot and leg (*icrele piciorului*, *capacul genunchiului*, *colacul genunchiului*, *cupa piciorului*, *merișorul gleznei*, *nuca piciorului*) etc.

Although we have chosen only compound structures in order to more quickly identify the body parts they refer to, one should also heed the filiation of *simple* metaphors, made up of a single word, which, in many cases, may result from “truncating” *syntagmatic* metaphors consisting of “one simple metaphor and a determiner”⁴². For example, *cucuruz*, *poamă*, *nod*, simple metaphors standing for ‘the Adam’s apple’, present on map 37 of the ALR I/I, may derive from *cucuruzul grumazului*, *poama grumazului*, and *nodul gâtului/grumazului/beregății/de la gușă*, respectively, etc. On the other hand, to avoid the ‘homonymy’ between the neutral and the metaphorical values of a word, that word may be accompanied by a determiner for disambiguation purposes. For instance, K. Jaberg⁴³ considers that this is how the phrase *tâmpla capului* emerged in order to avoid the homonymy with *tâmplă*

⁴² Sala, 1958, p. 503, p. 504.

⁴³ *Apud* Sala, 1958, p. 504.

‘iconostasis’ (cf. *fluturele ochiului* ‘pupil’, *toarta umărului* ‘clavicle’, *oul genunchiului* ‘kneecap’ etc.).

In many of the listed situations, we are dealing with ‘derivative’, ‘second or higher degree’ metaphors⁴⁴, all the more so since the metaphorical meanings coexist in the speech of the same speaker or of the same locality. Such examples are *capac* ‘cap, covering’ → ‘top of the head’ → ‘skull’; *căpută* ‘upper part of the shoe’ → ‘upper part of the foot’ → ‘sole’ → ‘ankle’⁴⁵ → ‘thigh’; *foale* ‘bellows’ → ‘lungs’ → ‘stomach’ → ‘peritoneum’ and ‘abdomen’; *lapuc* ‘burdock’ → ‘palm’ → ‘sole’; *scăfârlie* ‘cup, hollow’ → ‘top of the head’ → ‘skull’ → ‘head’, but, in most cases, we cannot be certain if the actual pathway is the one we have imagined.

In some cases, there can be second-degree anatomical metaphors, i.e., formed in relation to a certain body part and later applied, by extension, to another part: *omușor* ‘uvula’ → ‘cheekbone’; *înghițitoare, mățăguș* ‘oesophagus’ → ‘uvula’; *andrea* ‘shoulder blade’ → ‘thoracic cavity’; *turloaie* ‘shin’ → ‘ankles’ etc.

The semantic transfer may often occur independently and, sometimes, simultaneously, in several directions, i.e., to two or more body parts that contain some of the characteristics of the item from which the transfer begins, as follows:

cămașă ‘shirt, article of clothing’ → ‘eyelid’
→ ‘placenta’
→ ‘peritoneum’;

cer ‘sky’ → ‘top of the head’
→ ‘sclerotic’
→ ‘roof of the mouth, palate’
→ ‘back of the hand’;

fluiet ‘whistle, pipe, musical instrument’ → ‘the Adam’s apple’
→ ‘bone’
→ ‘tibia’.

⁴⁴ Cf. Popovschi, 2014-2015, pp. 64-65.

⁴⁵ With the observation that, in order to get to the meaning ‘ankle’, it is not necessary to go through the ‘sole’ stage, i.e. to derive from it.

The same *forma mentis* may give rise to identical metaphors in places that are far apart. If these metaphors emerge in the speech of at least two localities that are not contiguous and which most likely share no connection in terms of foundation (the establishment of a group of speakers of one locality in the other etc.) or cultural, social, economic ascendancy of one over the other, then there is the same manner of perceiving certain aspects of reality, including the sphere of anatomical terms, which originates from an ancient ethno-cultural “gene”⁴⁶. It may be that “elementary affinity”, present even among speakers of different languages, that H. Schuchardt referred to, or, more broadly, according to I. Iordan⁴⁷:

“the same psychological needs create identical means of expression in such distinct idioms, without there being any mutual influence”.

In this regard, we should mention the independently created metaphors for ‘pupil’: *mărgeaua ochiului* pt. 637 Frumușița, Galați County and pt. 996 Orlea, Olt, cf. Ar. *mărdzeauă*, and *neghina ochiului* pt. 76 Fârliug, Caraș-Severin and pt. 744 Măgura, Buzău; for ‘kneecap’: *rotunda genunchiului* pt. 526 Santa Mare, Botoșani and pt. 959 Băcleș, Mehedinți, cf. *rotundul genunchiului* pct. 509 Concești, Botoșani.

9. Typology

In our research, we have found over 500 words with a role in the field of anatomical metaphor, in addition to the 70 names of other parts of the human body.

Structurally, we have identified more than 350 simple metaphors, over 200 derived metaphorical names, more than 700 metaphorical nominal

⁴⁶ An edifying example in this regard would be the name of an eye condition commonly known as *urcior* (‘stye’), a boil on the base of the eyelashes. Its etymon is a diminutive from *hordeum* ‘barley’, *hordeolus*, contaminated with the descendant of *urceolus* (> *urcior*, clay vessel). The use of the metaphorical diminutive is common in most Romance languages (see Vătășescu, 1997, p. 74), cf. Fr. *orgelet*, Sp. *orzuelo*, and among the regional Dacoromanian names (see ALRR. *Sinteză*, map 55, reference list) there are *orzoaică* (pt. 384, Covasna County), *orz la ochi* (pt. 0202, south-east Bessarabia) and even *orzișor* (pt. 09, 019, Bucovina). It is obvious that this Latin-Romanic equivalence is not lexically inherited, but points to the dissemination of the same way of seeing certain aspects of the surrounding reality.

⁴⁷ 1940, p. 98, *apud* Saramandu, 2008, p. 45, note 2.

phrases having the structure Noun₁ + Noun₂ Genitive (ex.: *mărgeaua ochiului, capacul piciorului* etc.), over 450 phrases with the structure Noun₁ + Preposition + Noun₂ Accusative (ex.: *steaua de la ochi, mărul din palmă, fluiera la picior* etc.) and more than one hundred other structures (ex.: *ochiul moale, ouăle de jos, scoiful capului*, contamination between *scoică* and *coif* etc.).

In terms of distribution, one may start from the “path” imagined by many scholars for the metaphor: myths (ancestral thought and imagination) → metonyms → metaphors, i.e., *universalia* of thinking, expressed differently through words. Thus, one may speak about *possible* (our emphasis):

a. Universal metaphors: *lumină* (and correspondents of ‘stea’, ‘soare’ etc.) ‘pupil’, *om* (and correspondents for ‘omuleț’, ‘copil mic’, ‘păpușică’) ‘pupil’ etc.⁴⁸.

b. (Greco-)Roman metaphors: *creastă* ‘top of the head’, *furcă* ‘sternum’, *mărul lui Adam*, *migdale* ‘tonsils’, *țest* ‘skull’, etc.⁴⁹

c. Balkan metaphors: *fluiet/fluietă* ‘shin’, *icră* ‘thigh’, *nucă* ‘the Adam’s apple’, *ochi orb* ‘temple’ etc.

d. Romanian metaphors: *ghioc* ‘skull’, *gogoasă* ‘eyeball; white of the eye’, *împărătuș* [diminutive of *împărat*] ‘uvula’, *lingură* and its derivatives *lingurea*, *lingurică* ‘concavity of the sternum’, *năpârci* ‘tonsils’, *neghină* ‘pupil’, *strungă* ‘nostril’ etc.

The distribution of anatomical names in Romanian is not homogenous. Some metaphorical denominations have become literary terms (*omușor*, *mărul lui Adam*, *spată*, *șira spinării*, *oul piciorului* etc.), some have a regional, more or less extensive circulation, whereas others are individual creations.

Both categories of metaphors, but mainly the stylistic ones, are in turn divided into two subgroups: “folk”, popular metaphors, known to the majority of speakers, and “regional” or even “local” metaphors, which are spread in various areas of the Romanian linguistic territory. Although they do not cover all zones, some “popular” metaphors, many of which have entered the

⁴⁸ Cf. C. Tagliavini, p. 1949.

⁴⁹ V. ALiR, cf. M. Müller, Ad. Kuhn, M. Bréal, *apud* Bârlea, 2022, pp. 40-46.

common language, are worth mentioning: *moalele capului* ‘crown of the head’; *scăfârlie* (still, not present in south-eastern Dacoromanian) and *tigvă* (not used in the north-west) ‘skull’; *lumina ochiului* ‘pupil’; *umărul obrazului* ‘cheekbone’; *strungă* (continued by *strungăreață* and *postrungă*) ‘gap teeth’; *nod* (alone or with determiners: *nodul lui Adam*, ~, *gâtului*, ~ *gâtulejului*, ~ *beregății* etc.) ‘the Adam’s apple’; *capul pieptului* (more compact circulation in southern Dacoromanian patois) and *furca pieptului* (more compact area in the north) ‘sternum’; *spată* (in Banat: *lopată*) ‘shoulder blade’; *podul palmei* ‘back of the hand’; *fluierul piciorului* ‘shin’; *ouăle picioarelor* and *nodurile picioarelor* (especially in western Dacoromanian) ‘ankles’ etc.

“Regional” metaphors are more numerous, but have had less chance of entering the standard national language than the previous ones. Among these, we may mention: *creastă* (Muntenia, Aromanian) ‘top of the head’; *ciutură* (Banat, Aromanian), *curcubetă* (Transylvania, Moldova), *doască* (Oltenia, western Muntenia), *gămălie* (the Apuseni Mountains, south of Crișana), *găoace* (Maramureș, Bucovina), *ghioc* and *troacă* (in the south-west), *oala capului* (the Apuseni Mountains, south of Transylvania) ‘skull’; *boabă*, *bobuleț* (Banat), *bumb* (Banat, southern Crișana), *feciorică*, *fetiță*, *fluture* (Oltenia, Muntenia), *mărgea* (Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian, sporadic in Dacoromanian), *om* (Aromanian) ‘pupil’; *ochiul orb*, *ochiul mort* (Transylvania), *moartea calului* (in the north-west) ‘temple’; *boabă*, *bobuleț* (Banat), *bumb* (Banat, south of Crișana), *feciorică*, *fetiță*, *fluture* (Oltenia, Muntenia), *lumea ochiului* (southern Transylvaniei and southern Crișana), *mărgea* (Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian, isolated in Dacoromanian), *om* (Aromanian) ‘pupil’; *mărul obrazului* (Banat) ‘cheekbone’; *poamă* (Maramureș and north of nordul Crișana and Transylvania) ‘the Adam’s apple’; *lingura pieptului* (Muntenia and Dobrogea) ‘(concavity of the) sternum’.

Here are some cases of *hapax legomenon* related to the notion of ‘pupil’: *alunița ochiului* pt. 414, *boaba de la ochiu* pt. 14, *boaba din ochiu* pt. 12, *bobina ochiului* pt. 703, *bobiiță* pt. 731, *boboleu* pt. 16, *boboloș negru* pt. 961, *boboloșul ochiului* pt. 2, *bobuleț* pt. 700, *bumburuș* pt. 944, *luminișul ochiului* pt. 375, *negruș* pt. 372, *negureață* pt. 794, *raza luminii* pt. 957, *sâmceaua ochiului* pt. 52, *steaua de la ochi* pt. 38, *șinta ochiului* pt. 868, *vederuța mică* pt. 929.

The anatomical folk metaphor points out many cases of congruence between Dacoromanian and South-Danube dialects, especially Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian (hence, the richer linguistic material), as shown by the following examples: ‘temple’: Dr. *ochiul orb*, Ar., Mr. *orbul ocl’u*; ‘pupil’: Dr. *mărgea*, Ar. *mărgeauă*, Dr. *mărgeaua ochiului*, Ar. *mărdzeaua a ocl’ului*, Mr. *mirğan lu uocl’u*; ‘eyelid’: Dr. *capacul ochiului*, Ar. *câpacu-a ok’u*; ‘palate’: Dr. *cerul gurii*, Ar. *țerlu-a guril’i*, dr. *cer de gură*, ir. *țeru de gură/γura*, Ar. *țer/țerr^u di gură*, Dr. *cerul de la gură*, Ar. *țerlu di la gură*; ‘the Adam’s apple’: Dr. *limba (cea) mică*, Ar. *limbă (limba) nîcă*, Ar. *limba țea/ațea nica*, Mr. *mica limbă*, Dr. *omușorul ăla micul*, Ar. *omu ațel nîcu* etc.

10. Conclusions

By applying the principles of linguistic geography and resorting to the results of linguistic investigations, materialised mainly in the maps of dialect atlases, we have managed to provide a comprehensive description of the metaphorization phenomenon in the field of human anatomical names, which has occurred at the level of diatopic variants of the national language.

The analysed forms reveal intrinsic dialectal aspects, the study of which may contribute to clarifying certain etymologies or highlighting areas where dialectal contact occurs, may show how word competition actually manifests itself and the struggle between innovation and conservative aspects and how linguistic layers have overlapped over time (cf. *linguistic geology* – A. Dauzat, *Les patois*, 1927). Furthermore, our analyses has produced a rich material for lexicographers: unknown meanings and sometimes new words.

There are also surprising results in terms of the expressiveness of metaphorical names (see *aluniță*, *feciorică* or *fluture*, which stand for ‘pupil’, *hudă*, for ‘nostril’, *bărbățel*, *clopoțel* or *liliac*, for ‘uvula’, *broaște*, *prigorii*, for ‘tonsils’, *cucuruz*, *fluier*, for ‘Adam’s apple’, *păienjeneală*, for ‘peritoneum’, *arbore*, for ‘thigh’, *gogonică*, *lacăt*, *pălărie*, *prâsnel*, *talger*, for ‘kneecap’, *merișoare*, *nuci*, *tuturigi*, for ‘ankles’ etc.).

Indubitably, metaphors do not have the same value, if we consider their genesis and frequency as well as their distribution area; but it is precisely the rare ones, which are often a hapax, that may have a greater metaphorical

load than the very common ones, which have sometimes entered the literary language and have had every chance to become well-worn, “blunt” metaphors, therefore, forms of catachresis. The cases of hapax are quite frequent and stand as eloquent proof for the creative potential of speakers.

We may conclude that the research of the manner in which metaphor manifests itself in the field of Romanian folk denominations of the human body confirms, once more, the wealth of the language as a fact and, at the same time, reveals, synchronically, diachronically and diatopically, a great capacity for the expressive enrichment of the language. Although the functional language does not always knowingly exploit metaphorical forms, they remain an imprint of a certain attitude towards something (concrete or abstract) that is an intrinsic part of the human being.

Abbreviations:

- Ar. – Aromanian
- Cat. – Catalan
- cf. – *confer*
- ex. – example
- Fr. – French
- It. – Italian
- Lat. – Latin
- lit. – literal
- Mr. – Megleno-Romanian
- pt. – point of inquiry
- Prov. – Provençal
- Pt. – Portuguese
- Rom. – Romanian
- Sp. – Spanish
- s.v. – *sub verbo*

Bibliography

ALAR – Nicolae Saramandu, *Atlasul lingvistic al dialectului aromân*, Vol. I, 2014, Editor: Manuela Nevaci, București: Editura Academiei Române.

ALDM – Petar Atanasov, *Atlasul lingvistic al dialectului meglenoromân*, Vol. I, 2002, București: Editura Academiei Române.

ALR I – *Atlasul lingvistic român*, Partea I, de Sever Pop, Vol. I. *Părțile corpului omenesc și boalele lui*, 1938, Cluj: Muzeul Limbei Române.

ALR II – *Atlasul lingvistic român*, Partea II, de Emil Petrovici, Vol. I. A. *Corpul omenesc, boale (și termeni înrudiți)*. B. *Familia, nașterea, copilăria, nunta, moartea, viața religioasă, sărbători*. C. *Casa, acareturile, curtea, focul, mobilierul, vase, scule*, 1940, Sibiu-Leipzig: Muzeul Limbei Române – Otto Harrassowitz.

ALRR. *Sinteză* – Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti”, *Atlasul lingvistic român pe regiuni. Sinteză*, Coord.: Nicolae Saramandu, Vol. I, 2005, Colectiv redacțional: Dana-Mihaela Zamfir, Marilena Tiugan, Verginica Barbu Mititelu, Carmen Radu, Irina Floarea, Mihaela-Mariana Morcov, Vol. II, 2012, Colectiv redacțional: Verginica Barbu Mititelu, Mihaela-Mariana Morcov, Manuela Nevaci, Carmen-Ioana Radu, Daniela Răuțu, Dana-Mihaela Zamfir, București: Editura Academiei Române.

BĂDESCU, Ilona, 2019, „Noțiunea ‘gură’ de la latină la română – cu privire specială la *röstrum*”, in: Universitatea de Vest Timișoara, Universitatea din Szeged, *Qvestiones romanicae VII, Călătorii și călători. Incursiuni culturale și lingvistice*, Vol. 1, *Lucrările Colocviului Internațional Comunicare și cultură în România europeană*, Szeged: Jate Press, pp. 38-45, disponibil pe site-ul <https://ciccre.uvt.ro/ro/qvestiones-romanicae/qvestiones-romanicae-vii>.

BÂRLEA, Petre Gheorghe, 1999, *Contraria latina – contraria romanica. Sistemul antonimelor în limba latină și reflexele sale în limbile romanice*, București: Editura All Educational.

BÂRLEA, Petre Gheorghe, 2021, “Latin mythology and its European reflexes”, in: *Diversité et identité culturelle en Europe & Diversitate și identitate culturală în Europa* (DICE), 18/1, București: Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române.

BÂRLEA, Petre Gheorghe, 2022, *Magia cuvintelor: studii de*

lingvistică. Ediție îngrijită, studiu introductiv, notă asupra ediției, credite și note de M. V. Constantin, București: Editura Universitară.

BIDU-VRĂNCEANU, Angela, 2000, *Lexic comun, lexic specializat*, București: Editura Universității din București.

BIDU-VRĂNCEANU, Angela, 2007, *Lexicul specializat de la dicționar la texte*, București: Editura Universității din București.

BIDU-VRĂNCEANU, Angela, 2008, *Câmpuri lexicale din limba română. Probleme teoretice și aplicații practice*, București: Editura Universității din București.

BLANK, Andreas, KOCH, Peter, 1999, « Onomasiologie et étymologie cognitive: l'exemple de la tête », in: Mario Vilela, Fátima Silva (ed.), *Actas do 1.º Encontro de lingüística cognitiva*, Porto: Tipografia Nunes, pp. 49-72, disponibil pe site-ul <http://ler.letras.up.pt/uploads/ficheiros/4476.pdf>.

BRÂNCUȘ, Grigore, 1991, *Istoria cuvintelor: unitate de limbă și cultură românească*, București: Editura Coresi.

CAPRINI, Rita, RONZITTI, Rosa, 2007, „Studio iconomastico dei nome della ‘pupilla’ nelle lingue indoeuropee e nei dialetti romanzi”, in: *Quaderni di Semantica. Rivista internazionale di semantica teorica e iconomastica*, XXVIII, N° 2, dicembre 2007, pp. 287-326, pdf. disponibil pe site-ul <https://www.academia.edu>.

CAZACU, Boris, 1941, « Les dénominations roumaines du foie et des poumons d'après l'ALR », in: *Bulletin linguistique*, IX, pp. 83-95.

CĂPRIOARĂ, Cosmin, 2014, *Limba medicală populară românească*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega.

CADE – I.-A. Candrea, Gh. Adamescu, 1931, *Dicționarul enciclopedic ilustrat „Cartea Românească”*, București: Editura Cartea Românească.

CDDE – I.-A. Candrea, Ov. Densusianu, 1907-1914, *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române. Elementele latine*, București: Librăria Socec, Atelierele grafice.

CORNIȚĂ, Georgeta, 1995, *Manual de stilistică*, Baia Mare: Editura Umbria.

COTEANU, Ion, 1973, *Stilistică funcțională a limbii române*, Vol. I. *Stil, stilistică, limbaj*, București: Editura Academiei Române.

COTEANU, Ion, FORĂSCU, Narcisa, BIDU-VRĂNCEANU, Angela, 1985, *Limba română contemporană. Vocabularul*, Ediție revizuită și adăugită, București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.

CRISTEA, Teodora, 2001, *Structures signifiantes et relations sémantiques en français contemporain*, București: Editura Fundației România de Mâine.

CRUZ ORTIZ, Rocío, 2018, „El origen y trayectoria de la metáfora *niña del ojo* en español”, in: *Tonos digital. Revista de estudios filológicos*, N°34, 2018, pdf. disponibil pe site-ul <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:SrlapzleTIJ:www.tonosdigital.com/ojs/index.php/tonos/article/download/1874/963> sau pe site-ul www.tonosdigital.com.

DA/DLR – Academia Română, 2010, *Dicționarul limbii române*, Vol. I-XIX, București: Editura Academiei Române.

DDA – Tache Papahagi, 2013 [1963], *Dicționarul dialectului aromân, general și etimologic/Dictionnaire aroumain (macédo-roumain), général et étymologique*, Ediție anastatică, Editori: Nicolae Saramandu, Manuela Nevaci, București: Editura Academiei Române.

DELL – Alfred Ernout, Antoine Meillet, 2011, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*, Ediția a IV-a, Paris: Klincksieck.

DER – Al. Ciorănescu, 2007, *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*, Ediție îngrijită și traducere de Tudora Șandru Mehedinți și Magdalena Popescu Marin, București: Editura Saeculum I. O.

DEX – Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan”, 1996, *Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române*, Ediția a II-a, București: Editura Univers Enciclopedic; 2009, Ediția a II-a revăzută și adăugită.

DGDS – *Dicționarul graiurilor dacoromâne sudice*, de Ion Ionică, Maria Marin, Anca Marinescu, Iulia Mărgărit, Teofil Teaha, Coord.: Maria Marin, Vol. I. Literele A-C, 2009, Vol. II. Literele D-O, 2010, Vol. III. Literele P-Z, 2011, București: Editura Academiei Române.

DSL – Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu, Cristina Călărășu, Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Mihaela Mancaș, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, 2001, *Dicționar de științe ale limbii*, București: Editura Nemira.

ECO, Umberto, 1996, *Limitele interpretării*, Traducere de Ștefania Mincu și Daniela Bucșă, Colecția „Biblioteca Italiană”, Constanța: Editura Pontica.

ERNOUT, Alfred, 1957, *Les noms des parties du corps en latin*, in: *Philologica II* (Études et Commentaires, n° 26), Paris: Klincksieck.

FELECAN, Nicolae, 2005, *Terminologia corpului uman în limba română*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega, Editura Argonaut.

FELECAN, Nicolae, 2005a, „Termenii corpului uman în perspectivă romanică”, in: *Studia in honorem magistri Vasile Frățilă*, Editori: Maria Micle, Vasile Lațiu, Timișoara: Editura Universității de Vest, pp. 231-244.

FRĂȚILĂ, Vasile, 2002, „Terminologia corpului omenesc în istroromână”, in: Vasile Frățilă, *Studii de toponimie și dialectologie*, Timișoara: Editura Excelsior Art, pp. 211-312.

FRĂȚILĂ, Vasile, 2011, „Câmpul semantic al lui *gură* în dialectul meglenoromân”, in: *Limba română*, LX, 1, București, pp. 59-68, disponibil pe site-ul www.diacronia.ro.

FRĂȚILĂ, Vasile, 2012, „Terminologia corpului omenesc în meglenoromână. *Capul*”, in: *Lucrările celui de-al XIV Simpozion Internațional de Dialectologie*, Editori: Nicolae Mocanu, Dumitru Loșonți, Eugen Beltechî, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Argonaut, Scriptor, pp. 180-212, pdf. disponibil pe site-ul www.diacronia.ro.

FRĂȚILĂ, Vasile, 2016, „Terminologia corpului omenesc în dialectul meglenoromân. Gâtul și trunchiul cu organele interne (III)”, in: *Fonetică și dialectologie*, XXXV, București, pp. 73-88, pdf. disponibil pe site-ul www.diacronia.ro.

GDLR – Gheorghe Guțu, 1969, *Dicționar latin-român*, Ediția a II-a îmbunătățită și adăugită, București: Editura Științifică.

IORDAN, Iorgu, 1940, « Les dénominations du *crâne* d’après l’*Atlas linguistique roumain* », in: *Bulletin linguistique*, VIII, pp. 95-141.

IORDAN, Iorgu, 1975, *Stilistica limbii române*, Ediție definitivă, București: Editura Științifică.

JULIÀ LUNA, Carolina, 2009, „Los nombres de la pupila en los atlas regionales de la Península Iberica”, in: *Lingüística Española Actual* (LEA), 31/1, pp. 89-131.

KOCH, Peter, 2008, "Cognitive onomasiology and lexical change. Around the eye", in: M. Vanhove (editor), *From polysemy to semantic change: towards a typology of lexical semantic associations*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins B., pp. 107-137.

LAKOFF, George, Johnson, Mark, 1980, *Les métaphores dans la vie quotidienne*, Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

LIVESCU, Michaela, 1984, „Metafora în numele părților corpului”, in: *Analele Universității din Iași*, pp. 81-89.

LIVESCU, Michaela, 2000, „‘Capul’ în limbile și dialectele romanice”, in: *Ion Coteanu. In memoriam*, Volum îngrijit de Doina Negomireanu, Craiova: Editura Universitaria, pp. 230-237.

LIVESCU, Michaela, 2003, *Locul limbii române între limbile romanice în perspectiva atlaselor lingvistice romanice: terminologia părților capului*, Craiova: Editura Universitaria.

MALGI – Radu Flora, 2003, *Micul atlas lingvistic al graiurilor istroromâne*, București: Editura Academiei Române.

MDA – Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”, *Micul dicționar academic*, Ediția a II-a, Vol. I-II, 2010, București: Editura Univers Enciclopedic.

MILICĂ, Ioan, 2017, „Mărul lui Adam”, in: *Cronica veche*, 11/2017, pdf. disponibil online pe site-ul <https://cronicaveche.worldpress.com>.

MORCOV, Mihaela-Mariana, 2020, „Denumiri înregistrate cu sensul ‘omușor’ în graiurile dacoromâne, pe baza răspunsurilor cartografiate în ALRR. Sinteză”, in: *Fonetica și dialectologie*, XXXIX, București, pp. 107-117, pdf. disponibil online pe site-ul www.diacronia.ro.

PAȘCA, Ștefan, 1927-1928, *Terminologia calului: Părțile corpului*, in: *Dacoromania*. Buletinul „Muzeului Limbei Române”, V (1927-1928), Cluj: Institutul de Arte Grafice „Ardealul”, 1929, pp. 272-327, extras din lucrarea de doctorat susținută la Facultatea de Litere și Filosofie a Universității din Cluj, în aprilie 1927, disponibil pe site-ul www.diacronia.ro.

PAVEL, Vasile, 2016, „Aspecte onomasiologice ale cercetării motivației în cartografia lingvistică și dialectologie”, in: *Philologia*, LVIII,

pp. 100-108.

POPOVSCHI, Liliana, 2014-2015, „Analiza onomasiologică a unor somatisme populare”, in: *Buletin de lingvistică*, 15-16, Chișinău, pp. 58-71, pdf. disponibil pe site-ul <https://ibn.idsi.md>.

SALA, Marius, 1958, „În legătură cu denumirea *mărului lui Adam* în unele limbi romanice”, in: *Studii și cercetări lingvistice*, IX, 4, București, pp. 497-510.

SALA, Marius, 1961, „Asupra metaforei reciproce”, in: *Fonetică și dialectologie*, III, București, pp. 203-210.

SARAMANDU, Nicolae, 2008, „Denumiri pentru «țeastă» în dacoromână (pe baza ALRR. *Sinteză*)”, in: *Fonetică și dialectologie*, XXVII, București, pp. 45-67.

SLAVE, Elena, 1986, *Metaforele limbii române*, București: /TUB/.

ȘĂINEANU, Lazăr, 1999 [1887], *Încercare asupra semasiologiei limbii române. Studii istorice despre tranzițiunea sensurilor*, Ediție îngrijită, studiu introductiv și indice de Livia Vasiluță, Timișoara: Editura de Vest.

TAGLIAVINI, Carlo, 1949, „Di alcune denominazioni della <pupilla> (studio di onomasiologia, con speciale riguardo alle lingue camito-semitiche y negro africane)”, in: *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli*, III (1949), pp. 341-378 (reluat în *Scritti minori*, 1982, Bologna: Patron, pp. 529-568).

ULIVI, Anca, 1969, „Termeni pentru rotula genunchiului (după NALR –Oltenia)”, in: *Fonetică și dialectologie*, VI, București, pp. 163-172.

VĂTĂȘESCU, Cătălina, 1997, *Vocabularul de origine latină din limba albaneză în comparație cu româna*, Institutul Român de Tracologie, Bibliotheca Thracologica XIX, București.

VINTILĂ-RĂDULESCU, Ioana, 1999, *Terminologia și problemele ei actuale*, Conferințele Academiei Române, Ciclul „Limba română și relațiile ei cu istoria și cultura românilor”, București: Editura Academiei Române.

VRĂMULEȚ, Marinela, 2012, *Metafora războiului în limbajul politic*, București: Editura Universitară.

VRĂMULEȚ, Marinela, 2021, „Reti sinonimiche e antonimiche di

metafore animalesche impiegate per raffigurare caratteristiche degli esseri umani”, in: *Analele Universității „Ovidius” Constanța*. Seria Filologie, XXXII, 2, pp. 362-374.

ZAUNER, Adolf, 1903, *Die romanischen Namen der Körperteile. Eine onomasiologische Studie*, in: *Romanische Forschungen*, 14, Erlangen, pp. 339-530, disponibil în format electronic pe site-ul <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27935493>.