

Metaphor in Economic and Legal Discourse of the Russian and English languages

*metaphor, official business style, economic and legal discourse,
Russian language, English language*

The contemporary cognitive linguistics recognises the significant contribution of metaphorical naming in creating industry-specific terminology.

Metaphor is understood as a word or expression used in a figurative sense on the base of the similarity of two phenomena or subjects in every respect [Cherdantsev 2012: 288].

According to the conceptual theory of metaphors (Lakoff & Johnson (1980)), it is assumed that all our thinking is organised metaphorically. This theory regards metaphor as a system that allows exploring it as high as at the text level. The communicative and cognitive functions of metaphor come to the fore [Tcaciuc 2013: 28], and the metaphor also aims to make a certain discourse pragmatic and understandable [Ghafele 2004: 21].

When determining the place of a metaphor in an official business style, it is believed that the latter is incompatible with the prescriptive and commissive (relating to obligations) speech functions [Arutyunova 1990: 7].

In spite of this, contemporary studies point to the need for further research into the types, functions, roles, and places of metaphor in official business-style texts [Popova 2016: 193].

As is known, metaphor is an obligate, cognitively conditioned tool used to verbalize phenomena and events. Owing to the openness of economic discourse metaphors as well as economic ones come from various fields of knowledge into economic discourse. A contemporary Russian economic metaphor is a unified system consisting of separate metaphorical models and is closely related to national traditions and the national picture of the world; much as the system of Russian conceptual metaphors related to economics is somewhat influenced by the system of metaphorical models functioning in English economic texts [Kolotnina 2001: 8].

A legal metaphor, while functioning in the professional sphere and used as the most compact means of thought expression, is defined as a complicated cognitive phenomenon [Konstantinova 2011: 6]. In the language of law, according to A.F.Cherdantsev, metaphors take the character of terms or standard, stereotypical expressions, pursuing the goals of legislative economy [Cherdantsev 2012: 288].

Ways of studying metaphorical models in economic discourse suggest that the most frequent are metaphors that go back to the following (according

to A.P.Chudinov) conceptual spheres-sources: house (building), war, living organism, animal world.

When considering the differences between the English and Russian economic metaphors, a number of points should be noted. First, metaphorical categories in English texts are more common than in Russian ones: the fact is that in English the metaphorisation of common words is the main way to create economic terms, while in Russian many terms are borrowed and based on English transliteration. Second, even in cases where the same metaphorical models are implemented in Russian and English economic texts, certain frames and slots do not always coincide (e.g. 'swing' is a metaphor for 'mutual credit limit'), and the Russian transliterated term for 'swing' is not perceived as a metaphor. Third, the differences may be connected with the appearance of a particular model: for example, in English economic discourse, a criminal metaphor is less common, although it is characteristic of the contemporary Russian economic language. On the other hand, metaphors with the original semantics of alcoholic beverages and the consequences of their consumption (e.g., 'drunk markets', 'drunk indices', 'stock markets suffer from hangovers'), and of animal world (e.g., 'bear market', 'bull market', 'tiger economy'), are used more actively in the English economic discourse.

Most often, the sphere of economic metaphorisation includes economic realities associated with naming of economic activity entities; experts engaged in the sphere of economic activity arrangements; specific types of economic activities (sales, purchases, banking operations, stock exchange transactions, etc.), securities and other documents [Kolotnina 2001: 222].

Metaphors in the language of law express actual concepts and socially significant phenomena in need of legal regulation and, as a result, realised in lexemes with high educational and associative potential. From the standpoint of form, terminological metaphors are grouped from one-word units to sentential formations that tend to use acronyms. Metaphorisation of terms and special vocabulary units is an actively developing process taking place in naming practices due to complicated international trends of unification and harmonisation of legal concepts in sub-languages of various legal branches [Vlasenko 2014: 28].

Earlier in the article we mentioned that the most frequent economic metaphors are connected with conceptual spheres-sources: house (building), war, living organism, animal world.

As for the legal discourse, Z.Kovecses points out metaphors connected with conceptual spheres-sources like machine metaphors 'legal machinery' and building metaphors 'lay the foundations' [Kovecses 2002: 31, 236].

Following Z. Kovecses, R. Jumanca analyzed English legal discourse in terms of variety of metaphors. The author studied different legal genres (laws, contracts, agreements and others) and distinguished 5 groups of legal metaphors: latin legal metaphors 'pro rata temporis'; personifying metaphors such as body metaphors 'feet of the law', moral values metaphors 'the Penal Code punishes'; reifying metaphors 'the accusation collapsed'; process metaphors

'legal battle'; sensory metaphors 'the judge touched on' [Jumanca 2012: 369-372].

Metaphors cannot be excluded from the economic and legal discourse of the Russian and English languages. Consequently, being a cognitive tool, they directly help to clarify complex economic and legal concepts.

References

Arutyunova N.D. Metaphor and Discourse / N.D.Arutyunova // Theory of Metaphor. – 1990. – P.5-32.

Cherdantsev A.F. Logical and Linguistic Phenomena in Jurisprudence: Monograph / A.F.Cherdantsev. – Moscow: Norm: INFRA-M, 2012. – 320 p.

Ghafele R. The Metaphors of Globalisation and Trade: An Analysis of the Language Used in the WTO / R.Ghafele // Journal of Language and Politics. – 2004. – Vol.3. – №3. – P.441-462.

Jumanca R. Types of metaphors in the English Legal Discourse / R.Jumanca // Romanian Journal of English Studies. – 2012. – Vol.9. – №1. – P. 366-372.

Kolotnina E.V. Metaphorical Modelling of Reality in Russian and English Economic Discourse: Dis. ... kand. filol. nauk / E.V.Kolotnina. – Ekaterinburg, 2001. – 246 p.

Konstantinova M.V. Specificity of a Legal Metaphor in an Individual Lexicon (Experimental Research): avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk / M.V.Konstantinova. – Kursk, 2011. – 23 p.

Kovecses Z. Metaphor: A practical introduction / Z.Kovecses. – Oxford University Press, 2002. – 285 p.

Popova T. G., Sachkova E. V. Metaphor in the Official Business Style / T.G.Popova, E.V.Sachkova // Bulletin of the Kostroma State University. – 2016. – Vol.22. – №5. – P.191-193.

Tcaciuc L. Translation Practices at the European Central Bank with Reference to Metaphors: thesis / L.Tcaciuc. – Aston University, 2013. – 286 p.

Vlasenko S.V. Metaphors in the Language of Law / S.V.Vlasenko // Vestnik of the Tver State University. – Series: Philology, 2014. – №4. – P.23-30.