

Internet Metaphors: a Cross-Linguistic Perspective

ALEXANDER TOKAR
UNIVERSITY OF DÜSSELDORF

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.

Keywords: conceptual metaphor, language contact, Internet metaphors, loan-translation, loanword, popular etymology.

RESUMEN: El propósito de este artículo es debatir si hay alguna conexión entre la comprensión de un concepto metafórico surgido en un idioma extranjero y los medios lingüísticos, es decir la préstamo-traducción, el préstamo y otros, a través de los que este concepto está verbalizado en otras comunidades lingüísticas. Se argumenta que el *website* no se puede traducir al alemán como *Netzort* (website), porque *website* por sí mismo no es entendido por los hablantes de alemán como un lugar en Internet, lo que la metáfora inglesa parece sugerir, sino como una colección de páginas Web conectadas. De forma similar, el *firewall* no es una pared diseñada para prevenir la extensión del fuego, sino un producto de software que protege contra *hackers* y otros intrusos malévolos.

Palabras clave: metáfora conceptual, lenguas en contacto, metáforas en Internet, préstamo-traducción, préstamo, etimología popular.

1. Introduction

The point of departure of the 2nd International Workshop on *Metaphor and Discourse: Where Cognition and Communication Meet*¹ was the well-known conceptual

1. I would like to thank everyone who commented on a presentation of this paper at the *Metaphor and Discourse* workshop on February 2-3, 2006.

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,² 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 linguists³) 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).

3. See Haser (2003).

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 ELECTRONICMAIL 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:

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

A loanword, on the contrary, is used only when literal translation of a SL metaphor is impossible for semantic or formal reasons.⁵ 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 Python⁶ 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.⁷ *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. Loanwords⁸

In Tokar (2006 *a*) 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,⁹ it can be said to be understood in terms of the same conceptual structure. As an illustrative example, consider the following German definitions¹⁰ 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 way¹¹ 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 (2006 *a*; 2006 *b*; 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.¹² 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,¹³ 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);
3. Internet-Auftritt. Umfasst viele einzelne Webpages (Internet-appearance that contains many individual web-pages).

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:

English	Russian ¹⁶
e-mail (message)	мыло (<i>mylo</i> 'soap')
e-mail (system)	Емеля (<i>Emelya</i> 'Russian masculine name')
shareware	шаровары (<i>šarovary</i> 'wide trousers')
homepage	хомяк (<i>homyak</i> 'hamster')

14. Baumgärtel (1998), who calls Internet "an imaginary museum".

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).

Corel Draw	горелые дрова (<i>gorelye drova</i> 'burnt fire wood')
IRC (Internet Relay Chat)	Ирка (<i>Irka</i> 'Russian feminine name')

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 phraseme *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*, *šarovary*, 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 самонадевающиеся шаровары (*samonadevajušiesja šarovary*, literally 'self-dressing trousers'). *Samonadevajušiesja šarovary* as used by Russian-speaking members of the Internet community is an

18. <http://www.bozzysworld.com/about/>

19. http://www.pinballrebel.com/game/pins/ij2/shop/ABOUT_ME.htm

20. http://ufies.org/archives/2003_10.html

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>).

22. "*Beta-tester primerjaet šarovary*" is the title of an article that was published in *Computer* (Russian Computer magazine) on October, 20th 1998.

23. <http://technology.findlaw.com/law-technology-dictionary/beta-test.html>

expression which denotes a self-extracting archive²⁴ of a shareware, i.e. a zipped file with the executable extension which ensures that, once downloaded and double-clicked, its built-in unzipper 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.

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.

Works cited

- ANTTILA, R.** (1972): *An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*, New York, The MacMillan Company.
- BAUMGÄRTEL, T.** (1998): "Das Internet als Imaginäres Museum", *WZB Discussion Paper*, FS II: 98-110.
- BLANK, A.** (1997): *Prinzipien des Lexikalischen Bedeutungswandels am Beispiel der Romanischen Sprachen*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- (1999): "Why do New Meanings Occur? A Cognitive Typology of the Motivations for Lexical Semantic Change" in **BLANK, A.; P. KOCH** (eds.) (1999): *Historical Semantics and Cognition*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 61-91.
- CLAUSNER, T.; W. CROFT** (1999): "Domains and Image Schemas", *Cognitive Linguistics*, 10 (1): 1-31.
- DAGUT, M. B.** (1976): "Can 'Metaphor' be Translated?", *Babel*, 22 (1): 21-33.
- HASER, V.** (2003): "Metaphor in Semantic Change" in **BARCELONA, A.** (ed.) (2003): *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter. 171-194.
- HOCK, H. H.** (1986): *Principles of Historical Linguistics*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
- JÄKEL, O.** (2003): *Wie Metaphern Wissen Schaffen*, Hamburg, Dr. Kovač Verlag.
- JANSEN, S.** (2002): "Metaphern im Sprachkontakt – anhand von Beispielen aus dem Französischen und Spanischen Internetwortschatz", *Metaphorik.de*, 3: 44-74.
- (2005): *Sprachliches Lehngut im World Wide Web*, Tübingen, Narr.
- LAKOFF, G.; M. JOHNSON** (1980): *Metaphors we Live by*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- (1999): *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*, New York, Basic Books.
- LOMBARD, C. G.** (2005): "Conceptual Metaphors in Computer Networking Terminology", *South African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 23 (2): 177-185.
- MCMAHON, A.** (1994): *Understanding Language Change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- PEYTON, C.** (2002): *Das Neue PC-Lexikon für Alle*, Düsseldorf, Sybex.
- ROHRER, T.** (1997): "Conceptual Blending on the Information Highway: How Metaphorical Inferences Work" in **LIEBERT, W.; G. REDEKER; L. R. WAUGH** (eds.) (1997): *Discourse and Perspective in Cognitive Linguistics*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins. 185-204.
- SCHNADWINKEL, B.** (2002): *Neue Medien – neue Metaphern? Sprachliche Erschließung des neuen Mediums Internet durch Metaphern (deutsch-französisch)*, M.A. thesis, University of Hamburg.

- SCHÜTTE, D.** (1996): *Das schöne Fremde. Anglo-amerikanische Einflüsse auf die Sprache der deutschen Zeitschriftenwerbung*, Opladen, Westdeutscher Verlag.
- SPERBER, H.** (1923): *Einführung in die Bedeutungslehre*, Bohn/Leipzig, Kurt Schroeder Verlag.
- TOKAR, A.** (2006 a): "Metaphor and Language Contact" in Scott, A. (ed.) (2006): *Papers in Linguistics from the University of Manchester*, Manchester, University of Manchester. 99-109.
- (2006 b): Warum ist eine Webseite kein Webort?, Paper presented at the 2nd Conference of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association, Munich, October 5-7.
- (2007): Firewall, Brandschutzmauer, Požární zíd, Zapora sieciowa, Защитната стена... Zum Problem der Übersetzbarkeit Englischer Internetmetaphern aus Sicht der Kognitiven Metaphern-Forschung, Paper presented at the Tag des wissenschaftlichen Nachwuchses, Düsseldorf, June 22.
- TOMASZEWSKI, Z.** (2002): *Conceptual Metaphors of the World Wide Web*, Unpublished manuscript, University of Hawaii.
- ULLMANN, S.** (1957): *The Principles of Semantics*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- VOISKOUNSKY, A. E.** (2004): "Internet Communication in Russia: Constructing a Social Language" in SUDWEEKS, A.; C. ESS (eds.) (2004): *Cultural Attitudes towards Technology and Communication*, Murdoch, Murdoch University, 201-205.
- VOSS, A.** (2000-2006): *Das Große PC- und Internet-Lexikon 2000-2006*, Düsseldorf: Data Becker.
- WALDRON, R. A.** (1967): *Sense and Sense Development*, London: Andre Deutsch.