

REVIEW
COSMIN CĂPRIOARĂ, 2023,
DENUMIRI METAFORICE ALE PĂRȚILOR
CORPULUI OMENESC ÎN ROMÂNIA POPULARĂ,
CLUJ-NAPOCA, EDITURA MEGA, 284 P.

Marinușa CONSTANTIN
“Valahia” University of Târgoviște
marinusaconstantin@yahoo.com

Abstract:

This paper is intended as a review of the study in which Cosmin Căprioară analyses the process of metaphorization undergone by many of the terms designating human body parts in the Romanian folk language. The research is based on the cognitive theory of metaphor. In this case, the author has encoded an interdisciplinary analysis grid, using various methodologies and tools from dialectology, language history, lexicology and semantics, psycholinguistics etc. These were necessary in the operation of inventorying and delimiting the types of metaphors, resulting from semantic transfer, namely: *[concrete] for [concrete] metaphors* and *[abstract] for [abstract] metaphors*.

Keywords:

Anatomical terms, conceptual metaphor, Romanian folk language, diatopic variation.

The study *Denumiri metaforice ale părților corpului omenesc în româna populară* (‘Metaphorical names of human body parts in the Romanian folk language’), published in 2023 by Mega Publishing House, completes Cosmin Căprioară’s research landscape regarding the Romanian folk language¹. The monograph written by the respected professor from the Faculty of Letters at “Ovidius” University of Constanța is structured in two parts, preceded by *Argument* (i.e., ‘Argument’) and *Introducere* (i.e., ‘Introduction’) and succeeded by *Indicele părților corpului omenesc* (‘The

¹ Cosmin Căprioară, 2014, *Limbajul medical popular românesc*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega; Cosmin Căprioară, 2015, *Contribuții la studiul limbajului medical popular românesc*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega.

Index of human body parts’) and *Indicele metaforic* (‘The Metaphorical Index’). The author conducts a diatopic analysis of anatomical terms in folk Romanian, resulting from the process of metaphorization, without excluding, of course, the diachronic, diastratic and diaphasic axes. The book impresses primarily through its extremely rich inventory of terms and the interdisciplinary methodological tools used in the research, being a model of analysis in the national specialized literature.

In *Argument*, the author presents the main research direction, the premises of the study, methods and principles of analysing anatomical terms as well as the working corpus:

“(…) *we have aimed to highlight the expressive nature of the names of human body parts, examining atlases and determining how metaphorization covers established linguistic areas.*” (*Argument*, p. 9).

Naturally, such an object of study entails an interdisciplinary approach, as the researcher resorts, as he himself states, to various analysis methodologies encoded by other disciplines such as language history and dialectology, lexicology, semantics, comparative linguistics, ethnolinguistics or psycholinguistics, theory of mentalities, correlated with the cognitive theory of metaphor.

In regard to the premise of the work, the researcher considers that the study of metaphors occurring in a linguistic context that naturally tends to fade into oblivion, due to the rapid and profound changes in all aspects of traditional life and, implicitly, in the linguistic background inherited by a community considered, up to now, traditional, is necessary, as it relates to the desire of most to preserve intact the “*main mark of national identity*” (*Argument*, p. 10). Thus, highlighting the expressive nature of the lexemes that denote parts of the human body can lead to a deep understanding of how various linguistic communities

“*have reacted, through language, to their positioning as individuals in a certain space and to their relation with older or newer patterns, in an attempt to establish their identity.*” (*Ibidem*)

The *Introduction* describes the main sources based on which the inventory of metaphorical anatomical terms in diatopic variants was compiled, as well as the operations of identifying and locating lexemes,

according to the *tertium comparationis*. At the same time, the author describes the structure of the work, stating:

“With its two parts, one dedicated to inventorying the metaphorical terms in the field of denominations of the human body parts and the other to classifying them according to various lexico-semantic and grammatical criteria, this work naturally fits into our concerns to discover and understand the particular way in which the Romanian language is constituted and functions in terms of diatopic, regional variation.” (Introduction, p. 12)

In terms of the sources used, these are represented by the first two volumes of *Atlasul lingvistic român pe regiuni. Sinteză* (ALLR. *Sinteză*), as well as the volumes dedicated to the parts of the human body in *Atlasul lingvistic român*, part one (ALR I/I, ALR I/II) and part two (ALR II/I) for the Daco-Romanian variants. As regards the South-Danubian dialects, the working material was excerpted from more recent atlases: *Atlasul lingvistic al dialectului aromân* (ALAR), *Atlasul lingvistic ale dialectului meglenoromân* (ALDM) and *Micul atlas lingvistic al graiurilor istroromâne* (MALGI). The information from these atlases was compared with that from Romanian language dictionaries, DA/DLR, MDA, DER, DELR, for etymologies and meanings, on the one hand, and for completing the inventory of metaphorical terms designating human body parts, on the other hand. Furthermore, it is specified that, dealing with folk and dialectal variants, the author literarized the excerpted terms and, where phonetic or morphological issues were identified, a simplified phonetic transcription was used.

The clarifications regarding the operations of identifying and locating the lexical units listed are extremely useful, as they explain that these operations were carried out based on the tools provided by motivational linguistics. In the given context, the systematization of the metaphorical names of human body parts resulting from a process of metaphorization was done from a dual perspective:

- i) stylistic, with the units being referred to as *expressive metaphors*;
- ii) semantic, based on the existence of motivation of the linguistic sign, referred to as *motivated metaphors*;

Their emergence is explained through the human need to express imagination, expressiveness and affectivity, and their motivation is related

directly or through intermediate links to the fundamental semes of the denotative meaning.

Starting from the observation that anatomical terms have a privileged position within the lexicon of any language, due to their frequency in daily communication and, of course, the satisfaction of conditions such as age and stability, derivation power and metaphorization by units that belong to the fundamental vocabulary, the analysis of metaphor in this work is directed towards interpreting the complex relationship between language and society:

“Since ancient times, humans have searched for similarities among elements of their surrounding universe and have semantically loaded the lexical units of a little evolved language. As human society has developed, language has become more complex, enriching its inventory as well.” (Introduction, p. 14)

With regard to the expressive nature of anatomical terms at the folk and dialectal level, C. Căprioară believes that although language evolves naturally, polysemy plays a significant role in the process of semantic transfer manifested to varying degrees. In this case, the complexity of the phenomenon of polysemy within the denomination of human body parts is proven diachronically. For example, the resemblance between the skull (*țeastă*) and a hollow clay vessel led to the Latin *testa* designating both notions in the folk variant, and Romance languages transformed that metaphor into a denotative meaning, cf. Italian, Provençal, Catalan *testa*, French *tête* ‘head’, Romanian *țeastă*, Spanish *testa* ‘skull’, Portuguese *testa* ‘forehead’ (*Introduction*, pp. 14-15). Furthermore, the author highlights several inherited anatomical terms that underwent a process of metaphorization as early as the Latin period, usually in the folk variant of the language, such as: *geană* ‘eyelash’ (< Latin *gena* ‘cheek; eyelid’ → ‘eye socket’), *gură* ‘mouth’ (Latin *gula* ‘throat, neck’), *inimă* ‘heart’ (< Latin *anima* ‘soul’), *piele* ‘skin’ (< Latin *pellis* ‘animal skin’ and ‘animal fur’) etc. (*Introduction*, p. 15).

In the following sections of the *Introduction*, the researcher provides clarifications regarding the treatment of names of human body parts present in dialectal varieties of a language as elements of folk anatomical terminology. As this is a folk terminology that involves a process of semantic specialization in a spontaneous, unsystematic manner, the component units of

a subset of the general lexicon of the Romanian language do not fully satisfy the conditions of ‘non-ambiguity’ and ‘monoreferentiality’. Therefore, arguments are put forth which validate the inventory of anatomical terms in a diatopic and diastratic variant as a lexico-semantic field of the common language, in which, similar to a terminology, one operates with a finite number of lexical units, structured in a paradigm functioning within a certain taxonomy.

Furthermore, Cosmin Căprioară describes the concepts used in illustrating the folk names of human body parts with a metaphorical value, indicating:

i) *etymological metaphors*, those inherited elements present in both Daco-Romanian and South-Danubian dialects, many of them being catachreses;

ii) *linguistic metaphors*, ‘*naming metaphors*’ and ‘*stylistic metaphors*’;

iii) *derived metaphors*, whose existence is based on “*semantic paradigms that resemble synonymic series, conceived very broadly*” (*Introduction*, p. 20);

iv) *reciprocal metaphors*, both types being subordinate to synonymic derivation.

In the case of the latter types, several language facts created through various linguistic mechanisms are listed:

a) by identifying, for example, the human head first with a pumpkin and subsequently with other fruits of plants from the same family – the gourd etc. or with other plants similar in shape – radish etc.;

b) by substituting a component: cf. the phrase *mărul lui Adam* ‘the Adam’s apple’, which became *mărul gâtului* ‘the apple of the throat’ by replacing the second component, or *cucuruzul gâtului* ‘cone of the throat’ by reorienting the image towards the first element of the structure;

c) by avoiding the homonymy between the neutral value and the expressive value of a lexeme: cf. the phrase *tâmpla capului* ‘the temple of the head’ formed in order to avoid ambiguity in relation to the term *tâmplă* meaning ‘the front part of the altar’ (‘iconostasis’) (*Introduction*, pp. 20-21).

The first part of the study, *Denumiri populare românești ale părților corpului omenesc, cu valoare metaforică* (‘Romanian folk names of human body parts with metaphorical value’), representing the focus of the research conducted by C. Căprioară, presents the analysis of terms extracted based on the cognitive theory of metaphor (CTM), which considers our conceptual system to be metaphorical in nature.

Thus, according to the CTM, the manifestation of metaphor involves two levels:

i) in-depth level, where *conceptual metaphors* are created, resulting from the ontological and epistemic correspondences between the constitutive domains of the metaphor;

ii) surface level, where *linguistic metaphors* emerge, with the role of lexicalizing the conceptual ones.

Thus, conceptualization represents a *metaphor*, perceived as a “unitary, spontaneous, and immediate expression of a vision, intuition”², which consists in the momentary identification of different objects, such as *cap – dovleac* ‘head – pumpkin’. In fact, in the CTM, metaphor is analysed as an indispensable presence in everyday communication³, which involves “manifestations of the relationship between the objective and the subjective in verbal designation of reality” (Introduction, p. 20).

After presenting the theoretical framework, the author establishes that the expressive names of human body parts make up a *metaphorical field*, which in turn is composed of *metaphorical microfields* generated by analogies produced through the intersection of multiple conceptual spheres. As these are folk and dialectal names, the researcher indicates the motivational pattern, which involved the identification of similarities (in Romanian language, *motiveme*) represented by “classes of homogeneous motivating signs” (Part I, p. 29) based on /form/, /colour/, /appearance/, /arrangement/, /attributes/, /function/, /size/, with various objects, with anatomical parts of other beings, with entopic elements and occasionally with phenomena from the speaker’s immediate universe. These are integrated into the subtype of metaphors resulting from semantic transfer /animate for animate/ and /inanimate for animate/.

In the present analysis, the recording of the names of human body parts with a metaphorical value, present on linguistic maps, was done according to the order established by the author: /creștetul capului/ ‘crown of the head’, /țeastă/ ‘skull’, /tâmplă/ ‘temple’, /albul ochiului/ ‘white of the eye’, /pupilă/ ‘pupil’, /coada ochiului/ ‘corner of the eye’, /pleoapă/ ‘eyelid’, /geană/ ‘eyelash’, /buca obrazului/ ‘cheek’, /umărul obrazului/ ‘cheekbone’,

² E. Coșeriu, 2001, p. 20.

³ G. Lakoff; M. Johnson, 2022.

/nas/ ‘nose’, /nare/ ‘nostril’, /falcă/ ‘jaw’, /cerul gurii/ ‘roof of the mouth’, /omușor/ ‘uvula’, /vârful limbii/ ‘tip of the tongue’, /strungăreață/ ‘tooth gap’, /gingie/ ‘gum’, /bărbie¹/ ‘chin’, /bărbie²/ ‘chin’, /grumaz/ ‘neck’, /amigdale/ ‘tonsils’, /mărul lui Adam/ ‘Adam’s apple’, /esofag/ ‘oesophagus’, /ceafă/ ‘nape’, /piele/ ‘skin’, /mușchi/ ‘muscle’, /os/ ‘bone’, /măduvă/ ‘marrow’, /claviculă/ ‘clavicle’, /furca pieptului/ ‘sternum’, /plămân/ ‘lung’, /coastă/ ‘rib’, /inimă/ ‘heart’, /spate/ ‘back’, /omoplat/ ‘shoulder blade’, /șale/ ‘loins’, /șira spinării/ ‘spinal cord’, /stomac/ ‘stomach’, /pânțece/ ‘belly’, /peritoneu/ ‘peritoneum’, /buric/ ‘navel’, /vintre/ ‘abdomen’, /fiere/ ‘gallbladder’, /ficat/ ‘liver’, /rinichi/ ‘kidney’, /umăr/ ‘shoulder’, /palmă/ ‘palm’, /podul palmei/ ‘palm heel’, /șold/ ‘hip’, /rotulă/ ‘kneecap’, /fluierul piciorului/ ‘shin’, /pulpa piciorului/ ‘calf’, /coapsă/ ‘thigh’, /talpă/ ‘sole’, /gleznă/ ‘ankle’, /ouăle picioarelor/ ‘ankles’.

For example, the description of anatomical terms in the field of /*țeastă*/ reflects a large number of metaphors, resulting from the analogy based on /shape/ with [round, semi-round, concave or circular objects], which validates the fact that metaphor is also a figure of thought, not just of speech (*Part I*, p. 29):

- i) [vessel made of clay/wood or metal, basket]: *boașă, cauc (caucă), căuș, cioi, ciutură, coașcă, coboacă, coif (coifă), coropcă, corugă, coștoafă, dihorniță, doască, găvan, oală, obadă, scafă, scăfărlie, tigaie, tipsie, troacă, veșcă*;
- ii) [pumpkin]: *betcă, boacă, bostan, cătrună, curcubetă, lubă, școibă, tigvă, tioacă, zgârvă*;
- iii) [peel, shell or carapace]: *coajbă, coașcă, găoace, ghioc (ghioacă, ghioace), scoarță, troacă*;
- iv) [hollow]: *beucă, boartă, corobaie, coștoafă, găvan, giutcă, scoibură, scorbură*;
- v) [hump, swallow]: *boldă, bolfă, boșolie, coacă*;
- vi) [knob]: *bociochină, căciulie, cioacă, gămălie, cf. bolda capului*;
- vii) [other round objects, protruding, rounded part of an object]: *capac, coapsă, șoftă, tâmpan*;
- ix) [curved, circular wall]: *coroană, veacă, veșcă*;
- x) [others]: *cecădaie, golf. (Part I, pp. 34-45).*

The analysis of the expressive nature of anatomical terms in folk Romanian led to the identification of a denominative pattern involving a semantic transfer mainly through the resemblance in /*form*/, /*function*/ and /*attributes*/, highlighting “*the imaginative leaps within this process* [of

metaphorization], *with results that are sometimes surprising through their linguistic expressiveness*” (Part I, p. 169).

In this context, the author notes that, in most cases, the transfer occurs independently, while in others, simultaneously, that is, towards two or more human body parts containing an aspect of the particularities of the object from which the transfer began. Among these, we mention:

- i) *cămașă* ‘shirt, clothing item’ → ‘eyelid’
→ ‘placenta’
→ ‘peritoneum’;
- ii) *cer* ‘sky, firmament’ → ‘crown of the head’
→ ‘sclera’
→ ‘roof of the mouth, palate’
→ ‘palm heel’;
- iii) *foale* ‘bellows’ → ‘stomach’
→ ‘belly’

or

- iv) *foale* ‘lung’ → ‘stomach’
→ ‘belly’
- v) *nod* ‘knob’ → ‘uvula’
→ ‘the Adam’s apple’
→ ‘kneecap’
→ ‘ankle’ (Part I, pp. 173-175).

In the second part of the book, titled *Clasificarea denumirilor metaforice ale părților corpului omenesc. Perspective lexico-semantice și gramaticale* (‘Classification of metaphorical names of human body parts: Lexico-semantic and grammatical perspectives’), Cosmin Căprioară expands the study of anatomical terms with metaphorical value at the lexico-semantic, morphological and etymological levels, aiming to obtain observations that are “*not only pertinent, but also correct regarding the researched linguistic phenomenon*” (Part II, p. 179).

The semantic-lexical organization of the inventory of excerpted units was done based on the transfer of meanings, following two parameters:

- i) *the quality of terms A and B, and*
- ii) *the elements of the surrounding universe.*

In terms of the distribution of groups of folk terms designating human body parts constructed based on the quality of the terms *A* and *B*, the author specifies that the majority of inventoried lexemes are metaphors created through [concrete]-to-[concrete] transfer. As regards the category of [abstract]-to-[abstract] metaphors, which is much smaller in number, the researcher notes that it is harder to detect as such, given that, in various cases, the transition from concrete to abstract may have been achieved along the way, before reaching the anatomical sense, cf. *gol, sec, uscat* ‘hollow, dry’ for *țeastă* ‘skull’; *amărăciune* ‘bitterness’ for *fiere* ‘bile’ etc. (*Part II*, pp. 180-181).

The delimitation of metaphorical formations based on the elements of the surrounding universe led to the structuring of 10 lexical subsets, which have the following superordinate terms: /animals and components of the animal kingdom/⁴, /components of the plant kingdom (vegetables, fruits, flowers)/⁵, /names of human body parts/⁶, /names of animal anatomy body parts/⁷, /various objects/⁸, /entopic elements/⁹, /celestial bodies, phenomena/¹⁰, /abstract, collective terms/¹¹, /diseases/¹² and /others/¹³. The diversity of domains highlights the speakers’ propensity for expressive names that appear, as the researcher emphasizes, depending on numerous variables.

⁴ For example, *albuș, babă, balț, bărbățel, fluture, gușter, icră, melc, năpârci, omuleț, pește, purcică, rândunică* etc. (p. 181).

⁵ In this case, words such as *albet, alună, bobită, coajă, cucuruz, ghinde, lubă, măr, migdale, nucă (nuci), os, pară, poamă, spic, tigvă* etc. (p. 181)

⁶ Among the numerous language facts recorded by the author, we should mention *arm, armur, bășică, bojog, braț, falcă, față, frunte, gură, inimă, limbă, mai, maț, omoplat, os, pălmuță, plămân, pulpă, rânză, ronț, spate, spinare, splină, stomac, șold, talpă, tâmplă, vintre* and so on (pp. 181-182).

⁷ *Aripă, arm, borhan, burduhan, but, cioc, coadă, corn, creastă, labă (labe)* etc. (p. 182).

⁸ In the given context, we are dealing with an extensive and diversified lexico-semantic field. We shall further on illustrate some very interesting lexical concretizations: *acoperiș, andrea, astupuș, baieră, boc, capac, capsă, corfă (scorfă), coroană, doagă, dric, drug, dudă, fereastră, fus, gămălie, lingurică, lopată, nod, popic, punct, punte, rozetă, rublă, ruletă, țeapă* etc. (pp. 182-183).

⁹ *Boartă, cale, capăt, cărare, cremene, cunună, cupă, curbă, glugă, grui, jgheab, locaș, prapur, punte, rariște, râpă, rotogol, strat, strungă* etc. (p. 183).

¹⁰ This field is extremely narrow, practically reduced to a few formations, such as *cer, lumină, stea* (p. 183).

¹¹ *Albeală, albeață, amărăciune, legătură, scăzământ, rotogol, văz, vedere* etc. (p. 183).

¹² Regarding this group, the number of metaphorical lexemes is reduced: *boldă, bolfă, bubă gâlcă, țâvnă* etc. (p. 184).

¹³ There are only a few formations included: *bont, flământ (flământzi), golf, lăturoaie (lăturoi), plăpând (plăpânzi)* (p. 184).

In this study, the classification based on the lexico-grammatical structure of metaphorical units reveals three major categories: i) simple; ii) derived; and iii) compound.

Among these, the category of compound formations is very well represented at the level of the units inventoried by C. Căprioară. These formations, treated as “*syntagmatic metaphors*”, contain an “*onomasiological base*”, represented by the central term and the so-called “*onomasiological characteristic*” (*Part II*, p. 189), expressed by the determinatum (i.e., the head).

The author describes the syntactic patterns underlying constructions with metaphorical value. It is noted that, at the folk and dialectal level, the pattern [Noun NOM + Noun GEN/+ Adj.] is the most productive; it covers numerous anatomical terms with metaphorical value. For example:

/crown of the head/: *capacul capului, clapa capului, cornul capului* etc. (p. 189);

/skull/: *coaja capului, scoarța capului, zgârva capului* etc. (p. 189);

/temple/: *făgurița capului, gleznele capului, groapa ochiului, încheietura capului, încheietura tâmplii, ochiul calului, secu capului* ș.a. (p. 190);

/pupil/: *alunița ochiului, bobina ochiului, fetița ochiului, fluturele ochiului, gămăliile ochiului, lumea ochiului, mărgeaua ochiului, vederea ochiului* etc. (p. 190)

Additionally, the analytic pattern [Noun + Prep. + Noun] is also common. In this case, the numerous structures based on [Noun NOM + Prep. *de la* + Noun ACC] highlight a particularity of folk speech. Observing the analysed maps, the linguistic facts inventoried indicate a great capacity for enriching the expressive folk-dialectal language stock. For example, the notion of /eyelid/ is designated by various constructions, such as *astupușul de la ochi, clapa de la ochi, plapuma de la ochi* (*Part II*, p. 197). Likewise, the metaphorical phrases for /the Adam’s apple/ emphasize the productivity of that pattern: *ciotul de la grumaz, ciotul de la grumaz, cucuruzul de la grumaz*, Aromanian *nodlu di la grumadz^u, nod(ul) de la gât, nodul de la Adam, nodul de la beregată* etc. (p. 197).

In the last section of the second part of the book, the categories of lexical units are presented, structured according to the etymological-formative criterion. Naturally, terms inherited from Latin are well-represented in the corpus excerpted from linguistic atlases. The author records 116 words, including *andrea, aripă, arm, așchie, bășică, balț, falcă, față,*

gură, iepure, inimă, jug, limbă, oală, ochi, piele, strat, urmă, venă etc. (pp. 204-205). The native elements from the Thraco-Dacian substratum are poorly represented, amounting to ten, including *căpută, groapă, grumaz, năpârcă, rânză, strungă, țeapă* (p. 205). In terms of old borrowings, Slavic and Slavonic words are relatively frequent, totalling 32 words, such as *bob/boabe, chici, ciolan, coajă, cocoș, coș, lopată, mreajă* etc. (p. 205).

Furthermore, numerous lexical formations (509 units, according to the author) are formed on Romanian soil, through various processes that validate, at the folk and dialectal level, the internal creativity of the Romanian language:

a) Suffixation is very productive: *albeală, albeață, albet, albineață, albuș, bombiță, dudureață, furculiță, rotiliță* etc. (pp. 206-207);

b) other mechanisms (analogy, contamination and conversion): *bumburuț (buburuț), gol* (noun), *lat* (noun), *rotundă* (noun) etc. (pp. 206-207).

In *Conclusions*, Cosmin Căprioară summarizes the main aspects analysed in his work, emphasizing the comprehensive view of the manifestation of expressiveness in the field of folk names, as the term *metaphor* includes not only metaphors proper, some lexicalized, others not, but also metonymic and synecdochic structures.

The author makes interesting observations regarding the process of lexicalization that tropes may undergo, which involves the generalization of the modified meaning of words subject to a process of evolution through metonymy, synecdoche or metaphor (p. 211). In other words, lexicalized tropes (metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche) are integrated into the phenomenon of *natural polysemy*, cf. *strungă* and *strungăreață, omușor, măr (~ ul lui Adam), spată, lingurică, șiră (~ a spinării), coș (~ ul pieptului), cruci (~ le spatelui), fluier (~ ul piciorului)* etc. On the other hand, the researcher delimits catachreses, such as *lumina ochiului, mărul lui Adam* etc., from stylistic ones, like *cerul capului, fluturele ochiului* etc.

Furthermore, in the final chapter, the researcher points out that anatomical metaphors are extremely numerous, a situation due to the analogy of form or function, and to the extension of the name of an organ to neighbouring organs (p. 203).

Cosmin Căprioară's book represents a topical study, a very well-documented and rigorously constructed research, outlining a picture of anatomical terms with metaphorical value at the folk and dialectal levels.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ALDM = Peter Atanasov, *Atlasul lingvistic al dialectului meglendoromân*, Vol. I, 2002, București: Editura Academiei Române.

ALLR. *Sinteză* = Nicolae Saramandu (coord.), Vol. I, 2005, *Atlasul lingvistic român pe regiuni. Sinteză*, București: Editura Academiei Române.

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

ALR I/II = *Atlasul lingvistic român*, Partea a II-a, de Emil Petrovici, Vol. I.A. *Corpul omenesc, boalele (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.

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

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.

DELR = Marius Sala, Andrei Avram, *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*, Vol. I. A-B, 2011, Vol. II, Litera C, Partea a 1. *CA – cizmă*, 2015, București: Editura Academiei Române.

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

MDA = Academia Română, *Micul dicționar academic*, Ediția a II-a, Vol. I-II, 2010, București: Editura Univers Enciclopedic.

NOM = Nominative

GEN = Genitive

CTM = Cognitive Theory of Metaphor

Bibliography

COȘERIU, Eugen, 2001, „Creația metaforică în limbaj”. Traducere din limba spaniolă de Eugenia Bojoga, in: *Dacoromania*, serie nouă, IV, 2000/2001, pp. 15-41.

LAKOFF, George; JOHNSON, Mark, 2022, *Metaforele prin care trăim*. Traducere din limba engleză de Alex Văsieș și Vlad Pojoga. Prefață de Simina-Maria Terian, Sibiu: Editura ULBS.