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ABSTRACT: The purpose of this article is to discuss whether there is any connection between the understanding of a metaphorical concept which emerged in a foreign language and the linguistic means, e.g. loan-translation, loanword, etc., through which this concept is verbalized in other linguistic communities. It is argued that website cannot be translated into German as Netzort (website), because website as it is understood by speakers of German is not a place on the Internet, as the English metaphor seems to suggest, but a collection of connected web-pages. Similarly, firewall is not a wall designed to prevent the spread of fire, but a software product that protects against hackers and other malicious intruders.
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1. Introduction

The point of departure of the 2nd International Workshop on Metaphor and Discourse: Where Cognition and Communication Meet was the well-known conceptual...
theory of metaphor formulated in the landmark work by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (L&J) – *Metaphors We Live by* (1980). The focus of this approach is not on individual instances of metaphorisation, but on abstract cognitive structures which underlie the metaphorical use of a group of semantically related items. For example, *attack* in *He attacked every weak point in my argument*; *demolish* in *I demolished his argument*; *target* in *his arguments were right on target*, etc. are linguistic realizations of the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR, in which the domain of ARGUMENT is partially structured around the domain of WAR.

One point of criticism which can be addressed to L&J is that in the conceptual theory of metaphor no significant role is attributed to the diachronic dimension (see Jäkel, 2003: 49-55). Whereas for a historical semanticist (see Sperber, 1923; Ullmann, 1957; Waldron, 1967; Anttila, 1972; Hock, 1986; Blank 1997) metaphor is mainly a mechanism of semantic change, L&J treat metaphor as a synchronic phenomenon, laying special emphasis on conventionalized metaphorical structures, such as e.g. ARGUMENT IS WAR, MORE IS UP (e.g. *my income rose last year*), LOVE IS JOURNEY (e.g. *our marriage is on the rocks*), TIME IS RESOURCE (e.g. *she is wasting her time*), IDEAS ARE OBJECTS (e.g. *Sally has an idea*) etc.

The fact that the diachronic aspect can be successfully integrated into the conceptual theory of metaphor has been (among other linguists) recognized by students of computer/Internet terminology (e.g. Rohrer, 1997; Schnadwinkel, 2002; Lombard, 2005). Consider, for example, computer-related meanings of *file* (‘a collection of data stored and retrieved under a single name’), *folder* (‘a collection of files’), *trash can* (‘a container for deleted files or folders’), etc. It can be argued that the semantic development undergone by these expressions was triggered by the conceptual metaphor COMPUTER SCREEN IS OFFICE, in which objects on a computer screen are represented as office tools.

It must be also noted that COMPUTER SCREEN IS OFFICE as well as many other conceptual metaphors which emerged in the English linguistic community became part of conceptual systems of other languages. For example, German *Ordner* (‘folder’), *Datei* (‘file’), *Papierkorb* (‘trash can’), etc acquired the same meanings of objects on a computer screen as their equivalents in English. Similarly, *Posteingang* (‘inbox’), *verschicken* (‘to send’), *Adresse* (‘address’), etc. can now be used with respect to both traditional and electronic mail.

Apart from semantic calques similar to folder > Ordner, inbox > Posteingang, trash can > Papierkorb, etc., new metaphorical concepts may emerge as a consequence of direct importations of source language (SL) lexical material. In connection with loanwords, there arises the question how speakers of a target language (TL) understand metaphorical concepts verbalized by SL original expressions. Whereas the loan-translation folder > Ordner indicates that speakers of German understand the concept [FOLDER] in the same way as speakers of English, it is not quite clear what is the

---

2. L&J seem to distinguish conceptual metaphor from historical semantic change (see Lakoff; Johnson 1999: 85).
metaphorical status of *homepage*, *firewall*, *website* as well as many other English Internet metaphors which in German are not rendered by any indigenous expressions.

Unclear is also the metaphorical status of those TL expressions whose semantic development results from their phonological similarity to SL metaphoric expressions. For example, Russian мыло (*mylo*), literally ‘soap’, is frequently used to refer to a message sent from one person to another via computer. Similarly, *Emilio* and Емеля (*Emelya*) – Spanish and Russian first names – may denote the system of an electronic mail. Proceeding from the classical (non L&J-based) definition of metaphor as “a use of a given item to refer to some new meaning by implicitly or explicitly claiming a semantic relationship or similarity between its established and its intended new meaning” (Hock, 1986: 285), *mylo*, *Emelya* and *Emilio* cannot be treated as metaphors, since their semantic development was not based on any semantic relationship between their established and their intended email-related senses.

For a cognitive linguist, by contrast, the absence of semantic similarity between the concepts [SOAP] and [E-MAIL MESSAGE] is of little significance. Far more important is the structure of a conceptual domain against which [E-MAIL MESSAGE] is conceptualised by speakers of Russian. According to Clausner and Croft (1999: 2),

[… ] concepts do not occur as isolated, atomic units in the mind, but can only be comprehended (by the speaker as well as by the analyst) in context of presupposed, background knowledge structures. The most generic term for this background knowledge structure is domain.

Thus, if it turns out that *mylo* (meaning ‘e-mail message’) collocates with other bathroom-related expressions – e.g. to cover with soap is used to refer to writing or sending an e-mail – it can be concluded that [E-MAIL MESSAGE] is conceptualised against the domain of BATHROOM. Moreover, *mylo*, in this case, would be a linguistic realization of the conceptual metaphor ELECTRONIC MAIL IS BATHROOM, in which writing or sending a text message via computer is represented as an act of personal hygiene.4

The main objective of this article is thus to discuss the role of conceptual metaphor in a situation of language contact. It will be analysed whether there is any connection between the understanding of a metaphorical concept which emerged in a Sl and the linguistic means (such as loan-translation, loanword and phonologically similar indigenous expression) through which this concept is verbalized in a TL.

2. Loan-translations

In a recent study on French and Spanish Internet terminology (Jansen, 2002; see also Jansen, 2005), it was suggested that the metaphorical nature of a Sl expression

4. However, if *mylo* collocates with terms related to traditional mail, e.g. to write a mylo, to send a mylo, etc., [E-MAIL MESSAGE] can be said to be conceptualised against the domain of TRADITIONAL MAIL. In this case, *mylo* is a realization of the conceptual metaphor ELECTRONIC MAIL IS TRADITIONAL MAIL.
determines how this expression is dealt with in a TL. Thus, according to Jansen (2002: 58), in both French and Spanish, the majority of English Internet metaphors are rendered by loan-translations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>access provider</td>
<td>fournisseur d’accès</td>
<td>proveedor de acceso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agent</td>
<td>agent</td>
<td>agente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attachment</td>
<td>pièce jointe</td>
<td>(archivo) anexo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bombing</td>
<td>bombardement</td>
<td>bombardeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bookmark</td>
<td>signet</td>
<td>favorito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>browser</td>
<td>navigateur</td>
<td>navegador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email</td>
<td>courrier électronique</td>
<td>correo electrónico, emilio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domain</td>
<td>domaine</td>
<td>dominio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drag and drop</td>
<td>glisser et déposer</td>
<td>arrastrar y soltar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gateway</td>
<td>passerelle</td>
<td>pasarela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homepage</td>
<td>page d’accueil</td>
<td>página principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>server</td>
<td>serveur</td>
<td>servidor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>sitio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A loanword, on the contrary, is used only when literal translation of a SL metaphor is impossible for semantic or formal reasons. This holds true for culture-specific and dead metaphors, such as **spam** and **cookie**.

The word **spam** is originally the name of a canned meat product that has been produced in the USA since 1937 by Hormel Foods Inc. The metaphorisation of **spam** is usually attributed to the Monty Python SPAM-sketch, first broadcast in 1970. The sketch is set in a restaurant where nearly every item on the menu includes SPAM. The path of metaphorisation **CANNED MEAT > UNSOLICITED COMMERCIAL E-MAIL** could not be replicated either in France or Spain, because neither the SPAM-meat nor the SPAM-sketch are known in these countries. **Spam** is thus a culture-specific metaphor (Jansen, 2005: 291).

In contrast to **spam**, the term **cookie** could have been easily translated into both French and Spanish – e.g. English **cookie** > French **biscuit**. The reason why the preference was given to the loanword is that **cookie** is a dead metaphor, i.e. speakers of English are no longer aware of any metaphorical connection between ‘a small flat or slightly raised cake’ and ‘a small text file that certain websites attach to a user’s hard drive while the user is browsing the website’ (Jansen, 2005: 193-94).

---

5. Similar ideas are expressed in Dagut (1976).
6. A popular British comic group.
7. Another reason why **spam** cannot be rendered by a loan-translation is that **spam** is an acronym which stands for a **shoulder of pork and ham** (Jansen, 2005: 291).
3. Loanwords

In Tokar (2006a) I argue that Jansen’s discovery is not a universal tendency that holds true for all linguistic communities. In German, for example, a number of metaphorical concepts which do not belong to SPAM or COOKIE-type metaphors are verbalized by English loanwords – e.g. homepage, firewall and website could have been rendered by Heimseite, Brandschutzmauer and Netzort.

If concepts expressed by loanwords are not necessarily culture-specific or dead metaphors whose literal translation is impossible for semantic or formal reasons, the choice between different means of dealing with foreign word material is not always rooted in the metaphorical nature of a SL expression. To find out why speakers of a TL decide in favour of a loanword, it is necessary to know how they understand metaphorical concepts verbalized by SL expressions.

With Internet terms, this can be achieved by a careful examination of their TL definitions. If a loanword can be defined in terms of its TL semantic equivalent, it can be said to be understood in terms of the same conceptual structure. As an illustrative example, consider the following German definitions of homepage:

1. Zentrale Seite einer Website (‘central page of a website’);
2. Startseite einer Website (‘starting page of a website’);
3. Die Seite einer Institution oder einer Person im World Wide Web (‘the page of an institution or a person in the World Wide Web’).

In all these definitions, homepage is referred to as Seite, which is the semantic equivalent of page. It follows that the concept of [HOMEPAGE] is understood in a similar way by speakers of English and German – as e.g. Tomaszewski (2002) suggests, homepage is a realization of the conceptual metaphor INTERNET IS A DATABASE OF TEXTUAL DOCUMENTS in which web-pages are viewed as “text documents much like printed pages in any book or magazine”.

By contrast, if a loanword cannot be defined in terms of its TL semantic equivalent, its meaning as it is constructed by speakers of a TL is then conceptualised against a background of a different conceptual domain. Firewall, for example, is never defined as Brandschutzmauer (‘firewall’), but as:

1. […] ein Programm zum Schutz des Computers vor unbefugten Zugriffen aus dem Internet (a program for a protection of a computer from unauthorised access from the Internet);

8. This section is based on Tokar (2006a; 2006b; 2007).
9. Or an expression which has a similar meaning.
10. I have consulted the following sources: Peyton (2002), Voss (2000-2006), ComputerBild (German computer magazine) CD-ROM 2005 and Google Definitions Search Tool.
11. Homepage is a ‘home’ page for speakers of English, and a ‘central’ or a ‘starting’ page for speakers of German.
2. Eine Software, die den unberechtigten Zugriff auf ein Computersystem verhindert (a software that prevents unauthorised users from accessing a computer system).

According to these definitions, firewall is a computer program / a software which serves to block unwanted access to a protected computer network. In contrast to homepage, which is defined as a ‘central’ or a ‘starting’ page of a website, firewall cannot be defined as either a firewall or any other kind of a wall. This is because speakers of German do not conceive of [FIREWALL] metaphorically, i.e. as a fire-resistant wall designed to prevent the spread of fire through a computer system.

In connection with firewall, it must also be mentioned that the English FIREWALL-metaphor implies that HACKING IS FIRE-RAISING. If firewall is literally a wall built to prevent the spread of fire, hacker is metaphorically a fire-raiser, a person whose aim is to set a computer on fire.

This, however, is not true. In neither English nor German is HACKING conceptualised in terms of MALICIOUS BURNING OF PROPERTY. Hackers do not destroy computers by setting them on fire. They break into a computer system in order to steal information. Hence, HACKING IS NOT FIRE-RAISING, but BURGLARY.

This conceptual metaphor has important implications for the conceptualisation of [FIREWALL]. If hackers are burglars trying to break into a computer system, firewalls do not serve to prevent the spread of fire, but to protect against hackers and other malicious intruders. Since [FIREWALL] is not conceptualised in terms of FIRE-PROTECTION, the English loanword is not likely to be rendered by the German loan-translation.

Similar to firewall, website cannot be translated into German as Netzort (website), because [WEBSITE] as it is conceptualised by speakers of German is not a place on the Internet, as the English metaphor seems to suggest. A website is, first of all, a collection of web-pages:

1. Zusammenhängende Sammlung von Web-Seiten, die normalerweise mit einer Homepage beginnt (collection of connected web-pages that usually begins with a homepage).

This is a metonymic conceptualisation, since websites do indeed consist of connected web-pages. However, as follows from definitions 2 and 3, [WEBSITE] can also be understood metaphorically:

2. Webangebot, das mehrere miteinander verknüpfte Seiten beinhaltet (web-offer that contains several pages which are linked with each other);

---

12. Hacker can also refer to “a person who enjoys designing software and building programs with a sense for aesthetics and playful cleverness” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hacker#Academic_hackers). This meaning, however, is not relevant here.

13. In both English and German.
Angebot (‘offer’) and Auftritt (‘appearance’) are German loan-creations, i.e. German words which bear no semantic similarity to the original English expression. Angebot stands for a range of products on offer, whereas Auftritt refers to an act of appearing in public.

If website is defined as Angebot, it can be suggested that the concept [WEBSITE] is conceived of as a digital counterpart of any product that one can buy in a traditional store. In the AUFTRITT-metaphor, by contrast, the global computer network is represented as a stage,\(^{14}\) and websites are seen as performances intended to impress a large audience of Internet users.

Finally, it must be emphasized that the definition test that was proposed in this section – a loanword = its TL semantic equivalent – does not always explain why metaphorical concepts are verbalized by loanwords. In the case of homepage, for example, the application of the test only shows that the concept [HOMEPAGE] is understood in almost the same way by speakers of English and German. However, it remains unclear why [HOMEPAGE] is verbalized by the loanword in German, whereas speakers of Spanish could translate it as página principal.\(^{15}\)

In the case of firewall and website, by contrast, the test does indeed provide the explanation why their loan-translations are not possible in German. Firewall and website cannot be translated as Brandschutzmauer and Netzort because firewall is not a wall designed to prevent the spread of fire, and website is not a place on the Internet.

### 4. Popular Etymology

Another means of dealing with foreign word material is to use a phonologically similar indigenous expression:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Russian(^{16})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e-mail (message)</td>
<td>мыло (mylo ‘soap’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail (system)</td>
<td>Емеля (Emelya ‘Russian masculine name’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shareware</td>
<td>шаровары (šarovary ‘wide trousers’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homepage</td>
<td>хомяк (homyak ‘hamster’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

15. Speakers of French and Spanish are likely to translate English Internet metaphors because of a lexical similarity between English and Romance languages. E.g. English site versus French site and Spanish sitio; English server versus French serveur and Spanish servidor, etc. (Tokar, 2006 a:103). Speakers of German, by contrast, seem to prefer direct importations of English lexical material because English terms are generally shorter than possible German equivalents, e.g. English browser versus German Durchblätterer. Another factor which may be relevant here is that Anglicisms when used in German tend to evoke a number of positive connotations, such as e.g. modernity and internationality (Schütte, 1996: 356).
16. One of the peculiarities of the Russian Internet terminology is that words such as mylo, homyak, šarovary, etc. co-exist with the corresponding loanwords from English written in a Cyrillic alphabet (Voiskounsky, 2004: 204).
Popular etymology is traditionally defined as a type of semantic change which is triggered by the similarity of two words, usually in sound. According to McMahon (1994: 183),

[...] one word is mistakenly connected with another which sounds similar, and a transfer of meaning then occurs. For example, country dance gives rise to French contredanse, and German Sintvluot, the earlier name for the Biblical flood, has become Sündflut, literally ‘sin-flood’ (with Sünde ‘sin’). A more recent example is the American replacement of Alzheimer’s Disease with Old Timers’ Disease.

This interpretation, however, does not seem to explain the use of a phonologically similar TL expression as a linguistic strategy of dealing with SL lexical material. It is very unlikely that speakers of Russian could have mistakenly connected mylo (‘soap’) with e-mail (‘a text message sent via computer’).17 In my opinion, this instance of popular etymology should be attributed to expressivity, which, as e.g. Geeraerts (1999; discussed in Blank, 1999: 63) suggests, is always at work “when speakers verbalize newly introduced or differently perceived concepts or give a new stylistic use to an already existing word”. The use of mylo to refer to an e-mail message is intended to create a humorous effect and therefore can be regarded as a means of achieving expressivity.

In connection with popular etymology, there arises the question about how speakers of Russian understand the concepts [E-MAIL MESSAGE], [SHAREWARE], [HOMEPAGE], etc. If e.g. [E-MAIL MESSAGE] is verbalized by mylo, is [SENDING AN E-MAIL] conceptualised as, say, washing hands (face, body, etc)?

As was mentioned in the introduction, this question can only be answered by examining the structure of the conceptual domain against which [E-MAIL MESSAGE] is conceptualised in the Russian linguistic community. If mylo is not the only Russian expression pertaining to the domain of BATHROOM which is used in the context of computer-mediated communication, it can be concluded that the popular etymology e-mail > mylo gave rise to the new conceptual metaphor ELECTRONIC MAIL IS BATHROOM.

To my knowledge, apart from mylo, it is only намыливать (namylivat’, literally ‘to cover/rub with soap’) that can be used to refer to sending an e-mail. This fact does not allow us to state that [SENDING AN E-MAIL] is understood as covering with soap, because mylo and namylivat’ are members of the same derivateme, and therefore the semantic development undergone by namylivat’ can also be attributed to its phonological similarity to e-mail.

More interesting is the phrase киньте в меня мылом (kin’te v menya mylom, literally ‘throw a soap at me’) which a speaker of Russian can say in order to encourage other people to send her an e-mail. The question here is whether the concept of the

17. This can be justified by the fact that mylo, homyak, Sarovary, etc. are slang terms which originated in the Netspeak of Russian speaking users of the Internet.
request [TO SEND ME AN E-MAIL] verbalized by *kin’te v menya mylom* is indeed conceptualised as a request to throw a soap at the intended e-mail recipient.

To my mind, the phraseme *kin’te v menya mylom* has nothing to do with the literal sense of *mylo* – usually we do not use soap in order to throw it at other people. Instead, *kin’te v menya mylom* seems to be modelled on a corresponding phraseme in English:

> [...]. Feel free to *throw an email at me*, check me out on Unruly Politics or MySpace [...][18] [...]. Well that’s it for now! *Throw an email at me* if you have any comments or questions! [...][19] [...]. If you do get one of these you’ll want to contact Paypal by their Contact Us page, and probably *throw an email to* [...], including the full headers of the email.[20]

The use of *throw* in *throw an e-mail* seems to originate from the conceptual metaphor *IDEAS ARE OBJECTS*, in which ideas are represented as physical objects that one can give (e.g. *Sally gave the idea to Sam*), take (e.g. *Sally took the idea from Sam*), throw (e.g. *Sally threw the idea at Sam*), etc. If ideas can be thrown at other people, it should also be possible to throw e-mails containing ideas which we want to share with other people.

If Russian *kin’te v menya mylom* is a loan-translation of English *throw an email at me*, it can be concluded that speakers of both English and Russian understand the concept of [SENDING AN E-MAIL] in terms of one and the same conceptual metaphor – TRANSFER OF DIGITAL INFORMATION IS TRANSFER OF PHYSICAL OBJECTS.

Whereas [E-MAIL MESSAGE] verbalized by *mylo* did not give rise to the conceptual metaphor ELECTRONIC MAIL IS BATHROOM, [SHAREWARE][21] verbalized by *šarovary* (originally ‘wide trousers’) seems to have created a new conceptual metaphor in Russian.

Consider the sentence Бета-тестер примеряет шаровары[22] (*Beta-tester primerjaet šarovary* ‘a beta-tester is trying on a shareware’). A beta test is a term for the second phase of software testing where a not-yet-final version of the software is made available to a limited number of users (called *beta-testers*) so that they can test the program and provide feedback.[23] The use of *primerjat* (originally ‘to put on a garment in order to see whether it fits and looks nice’) to refer to testing a software product leads to an assumption that [SHAREWARE] is metaphorically conceptualised as a piece of clothing that must be tried on in order to see whether it works or not.

This assumption can also be supported by the phraseme самонаружающиеся шаровары (*samonadevajusiesja šarovary*, literally ‘self-dressing trousers’). *Samonadevajusiesja šarovary* as used by Russian-speaking members of the Internet community is an

---

21. The English term *shareware* stands for a computer program which is distributed on a try-before-you-buy basis, i.e. it can be downloaded and used for a limited time for free, after which the user is requested to buy the program ([http://www.phptr.com/articles/article.asp?p=27569&seqNum=6](http://www.phptr.com/articles/article.asp?p=27569&seqNum=6)).
22. “Beta-tester primerjaet šarovary” is the title of an article that was published in *Computer* (Russian Computer magazine) on October, 20th 1998.
expression which denotes a self-extracting archive\textsuperscript{24} of a shareware, i.e. a zipped file with the executable extension which ensures that, once downloaded and double-clicked, its built-in unzipped automatically places the extracted files in a pre-determined folder.

Since šarovary is not the only term pertaining to the domain of GARMENT which is used in context of software, it can be suggested that the meaning of šarovary as it is constructed by speakers of Russian is a linguistic realization of the conceptual metaphor SOFTWARE IS GARMENT.

What is particularly interesting here is that this metaphorical structure is not based on any conceptual similarity between the domains of SOFTWARE and GARMENT. It emerged from the phonological similarity between shareware and šarovary.

5. Conclusion

The purpose of this article was to analyse whether there was any connection between the understanding of a metaphorical concept which emerged in a SL and the linguistic means through which it is verbalized in a TL. The results of the study can be summarised in the following way:

- A concept which is not a SL culture-specific/dead metaphor can be verbalized by a loanword. E.g. homepage, firewall, website in German.
- If a metaphorical concept is verbalized by a loanword, it is possible that:
  1. Speakers of a TL understand the concept in terms of the same conceptual metaphor. E.g. homepage is a page for speakers of both English and German. Homepage is thus a realization of the conceptual metaphor INTERNET IS A DATABASE OF TEXTUAL DOCUMENTS.
  2. Speakers of a TL understand the concept in terms of a different conceptual metaphor. In German, for example, website is not a place on the Internet, but (among other things) an Internet-performance (Internet-Auftritt). In this case, website can be said to be a realization of the conceptual metaphor INTERNET IS STAGE.
  3. The concept may lose its original metaphoricity. E.g. firewall is not a fire-resistant wall designed to prevent the spread of fire, but a computer program which protects against hackers and other malicious intruders.

- If a metaphorical concept is verbalized by a phonologically similar indigenous expression, it is possible that:
  1. Speakers of a TL understand the concept in terms of the same conceptual metaphor. E.g. e-mail verbalized by mylo in Russian is a realization of the conceptual metaphor TRANSFER OF DIGITAL INFORMATION IS TRANSFER OF PHYSICAL OBJECTS.

\textsuperscript{24} http://www.coredon.clara.net/internet_glossary-n_s.htm\#letter_s
2. Speakers of a TL understand the concept in terms of a different conceptual metaphor. E.g. shareware verbalized by šarovary is a realization of the conceptual metaphor SOFTWARE IS GARMENT.
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