



Faculty
of Arts

Palacký University
Olomouc

**Conceptual Metaphors Expressing the Concept of ‘Pursuing
Success’ in Czech and English Opening Letters of Annual Reports**
(Master’s Diploma Thesis)

Palacký University Olomouc

Faculty of Arts

Department of English and American Studies

Conceptual Metaphors Expressing the Concept of 'Pursuing Success' in
Czech and English Opening Letters of Annual Reports

Konceptuální metafory vyjadřující koncept ‚dosahování úspěchu‘
v úvodních slovech výročních zpráv v češtině a angličtině

(Master's Diploma Thesis)

Bc. Simona Chmurová

English for Translators and Interpreters

Supervisor: Mgr. Jitka Zehnalová, Ph.D.

Olomouc 2016

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto magisterskou diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně a uvedla úplný seznam citované a použité literatury.

V Olomouci dne 5. 5. 2016

Děkuji Mgr. Jitce Zehnalové, Ph.D. za pomoc, cenné rady, trpělivost a dobré vedení při psaní této práce. Dále děkuji své rodině a partnerovi za podporu a zejména za nekonečnou trpělivost, kterou se mnou měli.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	4
List of Abbreviations and Explanatory Notes	5
1. Introduction	6
1.2 Critical literature overview	15
2. On metaphor.....	17
2.1 Defining metaphor: some issues	17
2.2 Developments in metaphor theory and research: relevant remarks.....	21
2.3 Metaphor and culture: a few remarks.....	24
2.4 Classification of metaphor with respect to the analysis.....	25
2.5 Conceptual Metaphor Theory: some criticisms	27
3. The corpus.....	29
3.1 Opening letters and annual reports: genre perspective	31
4. The analysis: methodology.....	34
4.1 Metaphor identification procedure	35
4.2 Defining the target domain: some clarifications	46
5. The analysis: results.....	49
5.1 Movement, physical strength, and fight.....	60
5.2 Conclusions	65
6. Attachments	67
Opening Letter of the Annual report of Škoda Auto company, Czech (ŠA_cs).....	67
Opening Letter of the Annual report of Škoda Auto company, English (ŠA_en).....	70
Opening Letter of the Annual report of GE Money Bank company, Czech (GE_cs)	72
Opening Letter of the Annual report of GE Money Bank company, English (GE_en)	74
7. Summary	76
8. Bibliography	81
9. Annotation.....	88

List of Abbreviations and Explanatory Notes

AR	annual report
CMT	Conceptual Metaphor Theory (as proposed by Lakoff and Johnson)
CM	conceptual metaphor
LU	lexical unit
M	metaphor
MML	The Master Metaphor List
WIDLII	‘When In Doubt, Leave It In’ – a special category for the analysed metaphors, explained in the text.
GE_cs	the Czech version of the opening letter of the annual report of GE Money Bank company
GE_en	the English version of the opening letter of the annual report of GE Money Bank company
ŠA_cs	the Czech version of the opening letter of the annual report of Škoda Auto company
ŠA_en	the English version of the opening letter of the annual report of Škoda Auto company
ARGUMENT IS WAR	(small capitals; the form is ‘TARGET DOMAIN IS SOURCE DOMAIN’) a concrete conceptual metaphor
SUCCESS	(small capitals) a source or target domain of a conceptual metaphor; a concept (as understood in conceptual metaphor theory)
<i>Example</i>	(italics) typically indicates an example, a specialized term or emphasis
Highlight	(bold) emphasises certain lexical units for better orientation in the text

1. Introduction

As the title suggests this thesis deals with is the area of conceptual metaphor. According to Kövecses (2010a, vii) ‘[i]n the past six to ten years the theory of conceptual metaphor has become the most influential and widely used theory of metaphor’. Nowadays, the theory of conceptual metaphor is something well established. Works and researches dealing with this topic abound but there is still much to discover. The thesis presented is therefore only a small piece of the jigsaw puzzle that will shed some light on the phenomenon of conceptual metaphor, particularly in the field of comparative analysis of the Czech and English language.

The approach to metaphor adopted in this thesis is the one presented by Lakoff and Johnson in their well-known book *Metaphors We Live By* (2003¹; first edition is 1980) which inspired the thesis. At the start, there were questions such as: Are Czech and English conceptual metaphors different? How much do they differ? How are they translated? Should translators be aware of them? Thus, this thesis was originally meant to be a translation-oriented work, but during the course of data collection, it developed into a comparative study instead.

The scope of research of this thesis is **the identification of conceptual metaphors concerning the concept of SUCCESS in Czech and English texts, more precisely in opening letters of annual reports**. The concept of SUCCESS is taken as the target domain (more on domains later) and the analysis carried out for the purposes of the thesis aims to identify the source domains². After the identification of the source domains the concrete conceptual metaphors are going to be inferred and discussed.

Since the thesis is based on the **Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT)**, it is going to be presented briefly. The CMT is a theory of metaphor from a cognitive point of view, developed mainly by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. Their work *Metaphors We Live By*, published in 1980, is considered to be the main source of CMT and it has

¹ The e-book (online version) I worked with seems to have different page numbers than its hard copy; therefore, the page numbers might not correspond to normal books. It also lacks page numbers for the Afterword 2003. For that reason, I will refer to any quotes from this afterword only as ‘Afterword 2003’.

² In connection with the conceptual metaphors and source domains which are to be revealed by the analysis, I will be talking about them in plural since it is almost certain there will be more of them.

become a cornerstone work for many of the numerous researches that followed³. Naturally, it did not appear in a vacuum, its authors wrote the book on the basis of their preoccupation with meaning in philosophy and linguistics. Since then, their pioneering work on metaphor has influenced many fields of study. The multiple areas of study do not only apply to linguistics (where it contributed to the development of discourse analysis, pragmatics, and contrastive analysis), but also to cognitive science, philosophy, literary studies, politics, law, clinical psychology, religion, and even mathematics and the science as Lakoff and Johnson themselves claim in an afterword to *Metaphors We Live By* from 2003. It is not necessary at this point to delve deeply into the details about CMT because more will be discussed in **chapter 2**. Nevertheless, basic definition is relevant at this point.

CMT is a theory based in cognitive linguistics looking at metaphor as something omnipresent in everyday language use. CMT makes use of findings from other researchers, such as Charles Fillmore's frame semantics, prototype theory and family resemblance from Eleanor Rosch, Ludwig Wittgenstein and others, as well as work of Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf, also Jean Piaget, J. J. Gibson, Paul Ricoeur, Robert McCauley and many others (see Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 8-12). CMT claims, (and has proved by numerous studies) that language is largely metaphorical and not only language (they talk about English but some of their claims are or seem to be universal, including the metaphorical nature of language). Probably the most important idea is that our conceptual system, i.e. the way we think and perceive the world around us, is mostly metaphorically structured. Language is then only a surface representation of the above mentioned metaphorical structuring.

One of the important terms here is *concept* or *domain*. Concepts, or *conceptual categories*, are cognitive models into which our knowledge is structured so e.g. we have the concept of CHAIR which includes members such as stool, armchair, bar stool and others and, in this way, it holds true for most (if not all) of us⁴. The boundaries of concepts are fuzzy, concepts depend on culture, and they have other characteristics

³ Like any other theory, CMT was not accepted uncritically and some of the main criticisms can be found in Kövecses 2008. It will also be discussed in chapter 2.5.

⁴ By *we* and *us* I mean members of cultures which are similar. It would not relate to some primitive tribes in Amazon, for example. This is related to culture-dependency of concepts which is also discussed by Lakoff and Johnson (2003) and should be taken into account by anyone dealing with comparative analysis in CMT.

as well. These can be based on what approach we adopt. Moreover, Lakoff and Johnson (2003, 14) say that:

[o]ur concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people. Our conceptual system thus plays a central role in defining our everyday realities. If we are right in suggesting that our conceptual system is largely metaphorical, then the way we think, what we experience, and what we do every day is very much a matter of metaphor.⁵

The definition of **metaphor** should be commented on as well. From the cognitive perspective, metaphor is not a matter of words but a matter of concepts (Lakoff and Johnson 2003, Afterword 2003). For Lakoff and Johnson, said in words of Rodríguez Márquez (2010, 21), ‘a particular string of words is not in itself a metaphor but rather a realization of a ‘conceptual metaphor’ which (...) is based on our experiences and feelings’. Lakoff and Johnson claim (2003, Afterword 2003) that the idea of a metaphor being about words is one of the four false views on metaphor some people may have.

Since this thesis was inspired by their work, it is convenient to define metaphor in their terms. The two authors claim that ‘[t]he essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another’ (2003, 15-16). We could rewrite this statement as follows: metaphor is understanding and experiencing a *target domain*⁶ in terms of a *source domain*⁷. Or, the target domain is ‘partially structured, understood, performed, and talked about in terms of’ the source domain (ibid) which in other words means that the source domain gets *mapped onto* the target domain – more precisely *certain aspects of the source domain* get mapped onto the target domain. To be clearer, let us use an example from the analysis carried out in this thesis⁸.

⁵ For a brief introduction (not only) into concepts and related topics from cognitive linguistics see e.g. Schmid and Ungerer 2011 or Vaňková et al. 2005 (in Czech; related also to Czech language and Czech studies). More on cognitive science as well as metaphor is in Lakoff’s *Women, Fire And Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About The Mind* from 1987. For more about conceptual system in CMT see Lakoff and Johnson 2003 or Kövecses 2010a who provides a reader also with a useful glossary.

⁶ Also called *topic* or *tenor*.

⁷ Also called *vehicle*.

⁸ For the sake of clarity, let us now pretend for a moment that some of the outcomes of the analysis are already known.

As mentioned above, the target domain analysed here is SUCCESS, or more precisely PURSUING SUCCESS. One of the source domains which were identified by the analysis is MOVEMENT and we could say that there exists a metaphor⁹ TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE ON A JOURNEY – certain aspects of MOVEMENT (or BEING ON A JOURNEY) are mapped onto the concept (or domain) of PURSUING SUCCESS, therefore, PURSUING SUCCESS is partially structured, understood, performed, and talked about in terms of BEING ON A JOURNEY. We thus see SUCCESS as a *way which leads somewhere*, and *reaching the destination is gaining success*. This fact then reflects in language use so we can say, for instance: *We are well on our way to become an international volume manufacturer* (ŠA_en). However, it should be pointed out that not *all* of the aspects of a journey are mapped onto the pursuit of success as the word *partially* in the definition of CM suggests. Although the format of CMs is TARGET DOMAIN IS SOURCE DOMAIN, ‘the IS should be viewed as a shorthand for *some set of experiences* on which the metaphor is based and in terms of which we understand it’ (Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 31; emphasis added). **Chapter 2** will expand more on the issues that are related to dealing with conceptual metaphors.

This little sample leads to need for the **specification of the scope of this thesis**. It adopts a descriptive empirical approach and identifies conceptual metaphors with PURSUING SUCCESS as their target domain. It does so with four texts: two in English and two in Czech, which makes it a small-scale qualitative study with no ambitions to formulate any general rules. However, even small studies can contribute to metaphor research. As Cameron and Deignan (2003) pointed out in their study on tuning devices around metaphor, the outcomes of a small-corpus analysis can be taken as a good starting point for an analysis using large electronic corpus. In fact, they recommend using a small corpus prior to a large-scale study.

Such metaphor analyses (whether small or large) contribute to the still not entirely discovered area of conceptual metaphor and help the researcher uncover not only linguistic patterns, but also, cognitive models which users of particular language ‘live by’. This may be a good way to discover differences and similarities between languages, and therefore cultures¹⁰. Additionally, it helps translators to be aware of

⁹ By metaphor, if not said otherwise, what is meant is a *conceptual* metaphor (CM).

¹⁰ Metaphor and culture is discussed in many works. For the purposes of this thesis it should be sufficient to mention at least Lakoff and Johnson 2003; Hiraga 1991; Kövecses 2010a and 2010b.

the phenomenon of conceptual metaphor and as a result it should contribute to better translations¹¹. Good examples of the differences in concepts, (and therefore in conceptual metaphors) in two languages (namely English and Japanese) which are relevant for translators' work, are discussed by Masako K. Hiraga (1991).

The language materials for the analysis are **opening letters of annual reports** of two companies, namely GE Money Bank, a. s. and Škoda Auto a. s. – one opening letter from each company and their translations (they are attached in chapter 6 Attachments). As mentioned above, this was supposed to be a translation-oriented work. But, since it was not clear which of these texts were source texts and which were target texts, the purpose of the analysis was changed into a comparative one. Despite two of the texts being translations, it is assumed they are quality translations that are relevant sources of idiomatic language use and therefore suitable for the analysis.

This assumption is based on the fact that Škoda Auto is a well-established company with its own translation services. They operate in foreign markets and need to promote a good image of the company (especially with the opening letter which is very important in this respect – more on the genre of annual reports and their communicative purposes in **chapter 3**) so it is likely they will produce quality translations. Similarly, GE Money Bank is known as a strong Czech bank that is a part of General Electric, a multinational conglomerate corporation. Therefore, it can be assumed they would not issue a poor translation. Moreover, the Czech and English version differ (GE) a little (likely) in order to fit the English environment better so this would speak in favour of rather a quality translation. The reason for which two texts from each language were chosen, versus only one, is the two texts reduce the possibility of having a text which somehow (linguistically) deviates from the norm and would thus produce uncommon metaphors.

The analysed texts are referred to as follows: GE_cs/ŠA_cs for the opening letter of GE Money Bank or Škoda Auto (respectively) in Czech, and GE_en/ŠA_en for the opening letter of GE Money Bank or Škoda Auto (respectively) in English.

¹¹ The area of translation studies related to metaphor research is large and will not be dealt here.

The choice of opening letters of annual reports for the purposes of the analysis is not random. Annual reports (ARs) – whether they are financial, specialized parts or the narratives – are a matter of interest for many researchers¹². Opening letters (or CEO’s letters, Letters to shareholders etc.) belong to a narrative genre (unlike other parts of annual reports) and Zanola (2010, 6) notes that ‘[e]ven though the majority of studies regarding ARs have concentrated on financial aspects, nowadays, the narrative part is seen as an important area for study and research.’

Very simply said, the **purpose of opening letters** is to ‘present details regarding management and company strategies’ (Zanola 2010, 6). But the communicative purpose of ARs is more complex. Bhatia (2002, 10; emphasis added) classifies annual reports as a genre with mixed communicative intentions and says that ‘[a]nnual reports (...) often convey not only the annual performance of the company or corporation but also in a very subtle manner incorporate *promotional elements*, one of which is a typical selection and interpretation of positive aspects of the performance figures.’ In other words, companies want to present themselves in the best light possible and the opening letter is the perfect place to do so. To this de Groot (2014, 240) adds:

Thus, annual reports no longer have only an informative purpose; they also have a promotional purpose. Information about the corporate mission, strategy and performance needs to be accurate and transparent, but is generally presented in a way that encourages favourable perceptions of the company. This is particularly the case in the narrative sections, where the absence of disclosure regulations leaves room for creative authorship and impression management.

Due to the ‘promotional purpose’ of opening letters and their narrative nature, it seems that an analysis investigating conceptual metaphors dealing with SUCCESS is relevant and legitimate. Supposing that the promotional aspect would lead the authors of opening letters to talk about successful progress of a given company more than in other types of texts, it seemed only natural to establish PURSUING SUCCESS as the target domain of the metaphors analysed.

¹² For example Hynes 2004; Rutherford 2005; Zanola 2010; Rashed 2012, or de Groot 2014, to name just a few.

Metaphor analysis can be carried out in two major directions: top-down and bottom-up (see e.g. Kövecses 2008 or Rodríguez Márquez 2010). Rodríguez Márquez (2010, 49) clearly describes **top-down** approach that it

goes from a conceptual metaphor to the linguistic expressions. This technique consists of investigating a particular conceptual metaphor, identifying lexical units from the source domain of such a conceptual metaphor by using a thesaurus, and then producing a concordance of all the lexical units identified for that source domain to find out their regular occurrence along with their linguistic context.

Further (ibid) she adds, quoting Stefanowitsch (2006a), ‘that alternatively a search for lexical units linked to the target domain can be carried out.’

On the other hand, **bottom-up** approach is favoured by some researchers over the top-down (for the criticism of top-down approach see Kövecses 2008) and is also adopted by a so-called Pragglejaz group whose metaphor identification procedure will be followed. According to Kövecses (2008, 170) the bottom-up

approaches a large number of expressions (...) (e.g., an entire corpus), the metaphorical expressions are identified on the basis of a well established protocol (Pragglejaz Group, 2007), the metaphorical expressions are checked for their detailed behavior (semantic, structural, pragmatic, esthetic, etc.) in concrete contexts of use, and finally conceptual metaphors are established as a result of a multi-stage procedure.

The approach adopted below is a bottom-up. However, not entirely, since the target domain is established, there is only a small corpus, and while reading the texts for metaphors, linguistic expressions are included only if they are related to the concept of PURSUING SUCCESS. But, like the top-down approach, no concrete CM is presupposed and an already established and detailed identification procedure for metaphorical expressions is adopted, namely the MIP(VU)¹³ – more about this procedure is said in chapter 4, here only a brief introduction is presented.

¹³ See Steen et al. 2010

Lakoff and Johnson (2003, 14) provide a simple explanation why do research of CMs by looking at language:

Our conceptual system is not something we are normally aware of. In most of the little things we do every day, we simply think and act more or less automatically along certain lines. Just what these lines are is by no means obvious. One way to find out is by looking at language. Since communication is based on the same conceptual system that we use in thinking and acting, language is an important source of evidence for what that system is like.

Communication can, of course, be understood as a letter of a CEO to shareholders and the linguistic expressions he or she uses reflect their way of thinking.

To sum up the statements above, the process of the metaphor analysis would be as follows: At first, texts are read (and understood) and areas dealing with PURSUING SUCCESS are identified. Then these parts of texts are assessed (using dictionaries) with respect to metaphoricity and if relevant linguistic expressions are found metaphorical, then a concrete conceptual metaphor is inferred. More about this process, as well as the definition of lexical units or the dictionaries used can be found in **chapter 4**.

What this thesis is **particularly interested in** are the concrete conceptual metaphors. Once established, they are further assessed and classified with respect to various criteria. It can be presumed that there are more types of conceptual metaphors concerning PURSUING SUCCESS and this work will also be exploring whether some of them are more common than others. Furthermore, it will be discussed which patterns emerge and if these patterns could serve as a foundation for more ongoing large-size-corpus research. In addition, this thesis is also interested in (possible) similarities in the CMs in Czech and English. For that reason, the metaphors are divided into two major groups which I call ‘generic-level metaphors’ and ‘specific-level metaphors’¹⁴, based on their level of specificity/ generality – this is explained in chapter 2.4.

¹⁴ The terms *generic-level* and *specific-level metaphors* are taken from Kövecses (2010a).

Just by glancing at the texts, it is easy to think of an expression which shows the concept of PURSUING SUCCESS. Then, it can be hypothesized that the identified CMs concern some type of movement. How many of them are actually related to movement, however, remains to be seen. In addition to this, the etymology of *success*, as well as its Czech counterpart *úspěch*, indicate the movement element as well.

English *success* (according to etymonline.com; emphasis added) comes from *succeed*. *Succeed* originally meant ‘**come next after, follow after another; take the place of another, be elected or chosen for**’ a position, from Old French *succeder* ‘**to follow on**’ and directly from Latin *succedere* ‘**come after, follow after; go near to; come under; take the place of,**’ also ‘**go from under, mount up, ascend,**’ which comes from *sub* ‘next to, after’ + *cedere* ‘go, move’. As can be seen, movement is an integral part of the verb.

The Czech word *úspěch* has not clear etymology, but Rejzek (2001) suggests it could originally come from a prefix *u-* and root *spět* (English equivalent would be *to head for/towards something*) and Holub and Lyr’s (1978) entry for *úspěch* refers directly to *spěchati* (English equivalent of *to hurry*) which redirects to *spěti* (*to head for/towards something*). Again, in Czech there are indicators for a movement metaphor as well.

Lakoff et al. (1991) compiled a list of conceptual metaphors, the so-called *Master Metaphor List* (MML)¹⁵, which is a compilation taken from published books and papers, student papers at University of California at Berkeley and elsewhere, and from research seminars. It is by no means an exhaustive list, but, as its authors point out, it may serve as a base for further research. They reanalysed and grouped metaphors into a uniform format, but the list is unfinished and open to future additions. Some of the metaphors listed there could be, in compliance with the hypothesis presented above, relevant for the research carried out in this thesis and it remains to be seen whether (and to what extent) the identified metaphors here are overlapping or corresponding to those in MML.

The metaphor that could be relevant is ACTION IS MOTION but this CM is much generalized. It is presumed that the metaphor, as well as some of its sub-cases, might be relevant. It seems the most probable candidate of these sub-cases is PROGRESS IS

¹⁵ Available online at <http://araw.mede.uic.edu/~alansz/metaphor/METAPHORLIST.pdf>

FORWARD MOVEMENT, since it looks ‘natural’, but the outcomes of the analysis might prove otherwise. The **conclusions** and overview of the identified conceptual metaphors are dealt with in **chapter 5**.

As has been already pointed out, this thesis does not aim to conclude any general rules about conceptual metaphors in the given concept; however, it might provide a great starting point for further large-scale research. Moreover, conceptual metaphors are very often studied for their motivation¹⁶, i.e. why they have a particular source domain, what is it that is mapped from this source domain onto the target domain, and why – this is not the aim of this work since it would require another research, although it would be interesting to know the motivation.

1.2 Critical literature overview

Here, the most relevant sources used for the compilation of this thesis are going to be discussed.

The theory of metaphor adopted here, as already stated, is predominantly based on the work of Lakoff and Johnson, namely their pioneering work *Metaphors We Live By*. Although it should be emphasized that this thesis does not deal with all the issues this book addresses – some of them are only touched upon, some are left out altogether. Particularly interesting are the authors’ definition of metaphor and the notion of the target and the source domain. On the other hand, their classification of metaphors as structural, ontological, and orientational is not adopted. Furthermore, their preoccupation with the motivation and bodily basis of metaphors is not developed. Their notion of metonymy is adopted, but metonymy is not included in the analysis.

The analysed conceptual metaphors are assessed and classified with respect to their level of abstraction as it is discussed by Kövecses (2010a, 44ff.).

¹⁶ Motivation is discussed by Lakoff and Johnson (2003). Its importance is supported by the claim of Rojo López and Orts Llopis (2010) who studied financial texts. They (2010, 3301; emphasis in the original) claim that ‘[t]he aim of most of the current studies on metaphor from a cognitive linguistics perspective is not to achieve a characterization of the language of finance *per se*, but rather to profile the underlying contextual and ideological motivations that give rise to its linguistic features.’

The part dealing with genre of annual reports, or more precisely opening letters, draws on several authors: Bhatia (2002; 2008), Zanola (2010), Rashed (2012), and others. The analysis of annual reports, even their narrative parts, is relevant as numerous studies suggest; some of them were mentioned above (Hynes 2004; Rutherford 2005; Zanola 2010; Rashed 2012, or de Groot 2014). Some assumptions about the outcomes of the analysis are based on *the Master Metaphor List*, and *Metaphors We Live By*.

Most importantly, the procedure of the analysis follows the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP[VU]) proposed by the Pragglejaz group (in Steen et al.2010). Also Steen (2009; 2002a; 2002b) is referred to if needed. It should be noted that there is an original procedure MIP, which was later extended into MIP(VU) in order to encompass also non-metaphorical language use which is, nevertheless, still a realization of an underlying metaphor. The same approach is used in the thesis.

The use of dictionaries in MIP(VU) is supported by Steen et al. 2010. However, the present analysis deviates in some respects from the suggestions of these authors since they do not propose the usage of etymology dictionaries, which are used in this work. Concrete ways of deviation are discussed in the relevant chapter.

2. On metaphor

The following subchapters will be dealing with various aspects in the theory of metaphor. A definition of a metaphor has already been provided in the Introduction, but there are still some issues which need be addressed. The topics discussed include metonymy, the relation of a metaphor to culture, some approaches to metaphor classification, the development of metaphor theory, several remarks on the criticism of CMT, and very briefly the current state of affairs in conceptual metaphor research. The issue of metaphor identification procedure is discussed in a separate chapter on methodology of the research (chapter 4).

2.1 Defining metaphor: some issues

Before the cognitive view was accepted, a metaphor was traditionally characterised as a matter of language and defined with respect to language, without taking conceptual system into account. A good example of the ‘linguistic’, or ‘traditional’ approach to a metaphor is instantiated by Peter Newmark (e.g. 1988), who deals with metaphor with respect to translation. He does not seem to take the metaphor and thought into account and classifies the metaphor into *dead*, *cliché*, *stock* or *standard*, *adapted*, *recent*, and *original*.¹⁷ According to philosophers Richard Rorty or Paul Ricoeur (in Hapková 2013, 25), our language is composed of *dead* metaphors, or lexicalised in other words – not perceived metaphorical by language users anymore. John Passmore goes even further by stating that if our language is entirely composed of metaphors, then the term ‘metaphor’ becomes empty and useless for theoretical use (*ibid*). Such a radical view is not adopted here.

However, such ideas raise a question of the extent of the metaphor, i.e. what is considered as a metaphor. Given the definition of metaphor – *understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another* – Steen (2002b, 21) rightly emphasizes that phenomena like simile, allegory or analogy (to name the most obvious ones),

¹⁷ The ‘linguistic’ view is not dealt with in this thesis any further since it would be irrelevant. Newmark’s typology is only illustrative; the ‘linguistic’ conception of metaphor typically classifies metaphor as ‘novel’ as opposed to ‘lexicalised’, labelling these groups variously and adding other groups sometimes. For brief discussion see e.g. Rodríguez Márquez (2010, 10ff.).

would be considered metaphors as well. Thus, the broad definition of metaphor is accepted in this thesis¹⁸. Indeed, an example of a simile is included in the analysis.

Concepts need to be discussed while dealing with CMT. Typically (and logically), source domain is more concrete and target domain is more abstract – e.g. LOVE (target, abstract) IS A JOURNEY (source, more concrete than love), or TIME (target, abstract) IS MONEY (source, more concrete). This aspect of a CM is not analysed in this thesis.

Lakoff and Johnson (2003) – and other cognitive linguists – say that some concepts are literal (like WAR) and some are metaphorical (like LOVE or TIME) – which means that not all concepts are literal as some theoreticians claim¹⁹. Thus, when a concept is literal, we do not need to use a conceptual metaphor to talk about this concept; and when a concept is metaphorical, we always use another concept to talk about it, i.e. we talk about such metaphorical concept in terms of a conceptual metaphor. Lakoff and Johnson (Afterword 2003) sum it up:

[E]ven our deepest and most abiding concepts—time, events, causation, morality, and mind itself—are understood and reasoned about via multiple metaphors. In each case, one conceptual domain (say, time) is reasoned about, as well as talked about, in terms of the conceptual structure of another domain (say, space).

Larger research is needed to back up any statements about the absolute metaphoricity of the analysed concept of PURSUING SUCCESS. However, it can be said with certainty that it is not one of the literal concepts.

Metaphorical concepts are also systematic, (see Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 18ff.), so when we have a certain CM, the CM can be observed in a language's use of words/phrases which belong to a source domain of the said CM – not only one or two words, but a multitude of words. An example provided by Lakoff and Johnson is TIME IS MONEY instantiated by words, (when talking/writing about time) such as *save*, *waste*, *spend*, *invest*, *borrow*... – they all belong to the concept of MONEY. This leads to

¹⁸ Aristotle also recognizes simile as a type of metaphor (see e.g. Kirby 1997).

¹⁹ Although Lakoff and Johnson are discussing the English language, it can be assumed it works for the Czech language as well, given their book *Metaphors We Live By* was translated into Czech while still maintaining its sense (with some inconsistencies but these were occasional).

‘entailment’ of metaphors, so e.g. this CM (TIME IS MONEY) entails more specific CMs TIME IS A LIMITED RESOURCE which further entails the metaphor TIME IS A VALUABLE COMMODITY – it works as a system of subcategorization. Whether similar entailments are present in the analysed concept of PURSUING SUCCESS or whether there are more source domains which are not that related (see below) remains to be seen.

With the example of the TIME metaphor, there were more source domains for the target domain of TIME – based on entailment. Sometimes, though, there are more source domains which do not operate in subcategorization terms. An example (again from Lakoff and Johnson) is the target domain of LOVE, which can be characterised by source domains PATIENT, JOURNEY, MADNESS, WAR, PHYSICAL FORCE etc. – these concepts are by no means entailments of each other (although some seemingly unrelated source domains might sometimes overlap and display entailment – however, these are details discussed in Lakoff and Johnson in greater depth). The existence of more source domains is related to ‘partial mapping’.

The target domain is understood only in terms of *some* of the aspects of the source domain, which map onto *some* of the aspects of the target domain. But if some other aspect of the target domain is to be understood by a metaphor and this aspect is not present in the source domain already activated, a new CM must be created, therefore, new source domain must be chosen. Subsequently, we can end up with more CMs for one target domain based on what aspects need to be understood by a metaphor²⁰.

Lakoff and Johnson discuss ‘coherence’ of different metaphors related to one concept – they may overlap, as said above, or they simply ‘fit together’ (2003, 55). Therefore, there should not be metaphors related to the same concept within one culture (or a smaller group, for instance a religious group) that would be contradictory (e.g. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO MOVE FORWARD and at the same time TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO MOVE BACKWARDS). Hopefully, this is not the case with PURSUING SUCCESS.

However, there might occur exceptions to the systematic metaphorical mappings – isolated, unsystematic metaphors ‘we do not live by’, which would deserve the label

²⁰ This system of multiple CMs should be understood as being within a single language.

‘dead’ (Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 65). An example is *foot* of the mountain – it is a fixed expression and no other part of this underlying metaphor A MOUNTAIN IS A PERSON is used.

Conceptual metaphors can also be, according to Lakoff and Johnson, classified into structural, ontological, and orientational, but as they admit later on, in Afterword 2003, this classification is ‘artificial’. Thus, it is not adopted.

Finally, it seems relevant to briefly mention **metonymy**²¹. The quite vague definition of the metaphor above could prod someone into thinking metonymy might be included. Lakoff and Johnson (2003) and their CMT provide an explanation why it should not be so.

Firstly, Lakoff and Johnson (2003, 46; emphasis in the original) claim that ‘[m]etaphor is principally a way of conceiving one thing in terms of another, and its primary function is understanding. Metonymy, on the other hand, has primarily a referential function, that is, it allows us to use one entity to *stand for* another.’ One reason to differentiate between metaphor and metonymy is therefore due to their function.

Secondly, and more importantly, there is a difference in the mapping (see e.g. Lakoff and Johnson 2003, Afterword 2003): simply said, a metaphor uses a cross-domain mapping (there are two domains involved, e.g. the domain of SUCCESS and the domain of MOVEMENT, as illustrated earlier), while metonymy makes use of only one domain within which the mapping happens. An example of metonymy provided by Lakoff and Johnson (2003, 48) is ‘*The Times hasn’t arrived at the press conference yet*’ where ‘we are using “*The Times*” not merely to refer to some reporter or other but also to suggest the importance of the institution the reporter represents’ – the domain remains the same for the reporter of *the Times* as well as for the newspaper company.

However, in the Afterword 2003 the authors admit there might be some confusion regarding the metaphor and metonymy and they further state:

²¹ Metonymy may further include *synecdoche* where the part stands for the whole, as in ‘*The automobile is clogging our highways.*’ (= the collection of automobiles) – example taken from Lakoff and Johnson 2003.

‘When distinguishing metaphor and metonymy, one must not look only at the meanings of a single linguistic expression and whether there are two domains involved. Instead, one must determine how the expression is used. Do the two domains form a single, complex subject matter in use with a single mapping? If so, you have metonymy. Or, can the domains be separate in use, with a number of mappings and with one of the domains forming the subject matter (the target domain), while the other domain (the source) is the basis of significant inference and a number of linguistic expressions? If this is the case, then you have metaphor.’

Vaňková et al. (2005, 94) mention that some authors do not distinguish the metaphor and metonymy much and instead talk about so-called ‘metaphoric-metonymic expressions’²². In the analysis here, this approach of fusing metonymy and metaphor is not adopted and metonymy is not taken into account.

As was said in the Introduction – that ‘a particular string of words is not in itself a metaphor but rather a realization of a “conceptual metaphor”’ – it is important to differentiate between a conceptual metaphor and the linguistic expression instantiating this underlying metaphor²³. The conceptual metaphor, which is a matter of concepts, not words, can be seen and perceived (and studied for that matter) through these linguistic expressions. And it is these expressions which the thesis analyses, first of all. A detailed description of the process of analysing the linguistic expressions can be found in chapter 4.1 (and possibly 4.2).

2.2 Developments in the metaphor theory and research: relevant remarks

Authors writing about the first theoretical preoccupation with the metaphor very often refer to Aristotle. But as John T. Kirby (1997) pointed out in his article ‘Aristotle on Metaphor’, it seems – although the evidence is not perfectly clear – that the metaphor was discussed even before Aristotle’s time. Because of the scope of his

²² The term *metaphoric-metonymic expression* is my translation of the Czech term used, *metaforicko-metonymická vyjádření*.

²³ See e.g. Kövecses (2010a, 4ff).

article, Kirby provides only two names: Isocrates and Plato. These two scholars seemed to discuss the metaphor in theory. Kirby also speaks of Homer but with respect to the *usage* of metaphor in his writings; it does not seem Homer talked about the metaphor in theoretical terms.

With regards to Isocrates, Kirby (1997, 523ff.) states he used the term *metaphora* and discusses Isocrates's writings which contain mention of *metaphora* in relation to Aristotle's use of the term. Kirby concludes by making the assumption that the two authors (Aristotle and Isocrates) each understood the metaphor differently.

About Plato, Kirby (1997, 530; emphasis in the original) says: 'Although it is true that Plato does not use the term *metaphora*, he does use the term *eikōn*, "likeness", not only of physical/visual resemblances but also of verbal comparisons that we would call similes.'

Kirby goes on to discuss Aristotle's discussion of metaphor in *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* proving Aristotle was preoccupied with this linguistic phenomenon. However, Kirby makes an interesting observation about Aristotle²⁴ – some scholars, typically associate Aristotle with the 'traditional', 'linguistic' view on metaphor which has nothing to do with thought and focuses solely on language, adding that (usually) the cognitive view was developed much later, in the twentieth century. Kirby (p. 538-539), on the other hand, argues (and provides evidence) that Aristotle's concept of metaphor was actually a prescient prediction of the cognitive approach. Kirby (p. 520) agrees with U. Eco who claims: 'of the thousands and thousands of pages written about the metaphor, few add anything of substance to the first two or three fundamental concepts stated by Aristotle'. Nevertheless, it is true the cognitive approach to the metaphor (and related research) started to be largely accepted as late as the twentieth century; and explicit discussions of the metaphor as such did not start to multiply until late 1920s (Wayne Booth in Kirby 1997, 517).

Cameron and Low (1999) agree with Kirby's opinion on Aristotle's cognitive view on metaphor and add that 'when Aristotle discusses metaphor in the particular discourse genre of political rhetoric, employed to achieve particular interactional goals, he offers a socially contextualised view of metaphor in use' (p. 9). Cameron and Low

²⁴ But he is not the only one; Cameron and Low (1999, 9) state the same.

continue by stating that this concern of the metaphor in use was later discussed, for instance, by Vico²⁵ and Tesauro in the 17th/18th century, and it seems it was during this time that the cognitive dimensions of the metaphor were downplayed, and ‘metaphor theory increasingly became the concern of linguists and philosophers working through formal logic’ (ibid). Therefore, centuries later, Lakoff and Johnson (2003, 13) could write that ‘metaphor is typically viewed as characteristic of language alone, a matter of words rather than thought or action’.

Within the ‘modern’ cognitive approach, however, it is not clearly defined what ‘cognitive’ means – as Cameron and Low claim (1999, 9). Currently, there exist three major branches of cognitive linguistics (see e.g. Vaňková et al. 2005): Firstly, research aimed at the brain and interested in neural science, neurolinguistics, and also artificial intelligence. Secondly, an approach aimed at the mind, cognitive psychology and psycholinguistics. And thirdly, there is research dealing with ‘collective mind’, culture and social aspects. The conceptual metaphor theory is based in a so-called ‘neural’ theory of language, which suggests it should belong to the first group; but Vaňková et al. (p. 34-36) list Lakoff and Johnson as representatives of the second, cognitive psychology, approach. Since the boundaries between the three approaches are not clear-cut, it does not seem to be a huge problem.

The research on metaphor in general, as has been said above, started to expand in the late 1920s. The cognitive approach was ‘triggered’ by the already mentioned *Metaphors We Live By* published in 1980. Although Lakoff and Johnson are often referred to as the ‘pioneers’ in their area of study (and no doubt they did a great deal of research), there is at least one figure who seems to be often neglected. He should be mentioned prior to the other two authors in relation to cognitive basis of metaphor: Roman Jakobson. Jakobson’s essay on two types of aphasic disturbances, published originally in 1956, focuses on and describes the two types of aphasia linked to two aspects of language, namely metaphor and metonymy (see Jakobson 1995a in Czech; 1995b in English). ‘Jakobson records his observation that the two major (and binarily opposed) component disorders (‘similarity disorder’ and ‘contiguity disorder’) seem to be strikingly related to the two basic rhetorical figures metaphor and metonymy.’ (Hawkes 2004, 59)

²⁵ Vico disagreed with a common opinion of his time that only literature was characterized by the use of metaphors (Ding 2007, 127).

Cameron and Low (1999, 11) label Lakoff's cognitive view as 'strong' opposed to its 'weaker' version represented by Quinn, Steen, and others. They also add that the departure from *language* of metaphor entirely, and purely cognitive approach with no interest in language is not desirable. Also, the prevailing approach to metaphor by reducing it to the form 'A IS B' is undesirable. The last argument may be true but, as stated earlier, it is still conveniently shorthand provided it is sufficiently explained.

There are many researchers focusing on the metaphor in the field of cognitive linguistics. At this point, some of the most significant figures should be mentioned with suggestions for further reading. Apart from the already mentioned Aristotle, G. Lakoff, and M. Johnson, other prominent researchers are: P. Ricoeur, A. Ortony, I. A. Richards (also interested in translation studies, like many other researchers), M. Black, G. Steen, E. Semino, M. Turner, A. Deignan, L. Cameron, G. Low, Z. Kövecses, R. Gibbs, or J. Charteris-Black. For discussion of metaphor research see e.g. Cameron and Low 1999 (in more detail), and for a comprehensive overview on metaphor (in general) other than *Metaphors We Live By* see Kövecses 2010a²⁶.

Currently, the conceptual metaphor is a matter of focus in many fields, not only in linguistics, e.g. in translation studies (I. A. Richards, Ch. Schäffner, N. Mandelblit, J. Dickins), literary theory, legal studies, law, teaching English as a second language (Deignan, Low, MacLennan), and possibly other fields.

2.3 Metaphor and culture: a few remarks

Since the thesis deals with a comparative analysis of two cultures, it seems convenient to mention, not in a lengthy manner however, some aspects concerning the relation of culture and the metaphor. At the same time, it should be emphasized that a comparison from a cultural point of view (e.g. to unravel the cultural motivation of the CMs) is not the aim of the thesis. The topic of culture and metaphor is discussed by many (of course, Lakoff and Johnson 2003; Kövecses, for instance, who wrote a whole book dedicated to this issue, *Metaphor in Culture*) and it

²⁶ To be more user-friendly, Kövecses claims, there are exercises after each chapter.

starts with definitions. The metaphor has already been defined, so now culture remains.

To define culture can be very exhaustive, since there are extensive works dealing with the topic, but for the purpose of this work, only a brief remark is sufficient. Culture is understood here in a broader term, which also includes language. With respect to conceptual metaphor it should be noted concepts are dependent on culture as it is discussed in *Metaphors We Live By*. Simply said, differences in conceptual systems of several cultures result in different CMs. Such differences are, for example, observed by Masako K. Hiraga (1991) who compares concepts in English and Japanese.

Since the Czech and the Anglo-Saxon environment – unlike the Japanese and the Anglo-Saxon one – do not seem to be radically different with respect to their conceptual systems, it can be assumed there are not significant differences in the CMs inferred during the analysis.

2.4 Classification of metaphor with respect to the analysis

Provided there are more conceptual metaphors in the analysed texts, it seems fitting to have some classification criteria which would sort these CMs into groups in order to make the outcomes more organized. The classification proposed by Lakoff and Johnson had already been rejected due to its ‘artificial’ nature (see Lakoff and Johnson 2003, Afterword 2003).

There is Hiraga’s (1991) classification, which is based on comparing not only conceptual metaphors as such but also their linguistic expressions. She distinguishes four groups of CMs and their expressions in two cultures/languages:

1. There are similar metaphorical concepts expressed in similar metaphorical terms in both languages (example by Hiraga: TIME IS MONEY).
2. There are similar metaphorical concepts expressed in different metaphorical expressions in the two languages (example by Hiraga: LIFE IS A BASEBALL GAME in American English, LIFE IS A SUMO GAME in Japanese – both are LIFE IS A SPORT).

3. There are similar metaphorical expressions in two languages, but these express different concepts in each language – if a language user is not aware of these, miscommunication may happen (example by Hiraga: SWEET IS GOOD [English], SWEET IS BAD [Japanese]).
4. Two languages have different metaphorical concepts expressed with different metaphorical expressions (example by Hiraga: IDEAS ARE IN THE MIND [English], IDEAS ARE IN BELLY [Japanese]).

I will leave aside the similarity between type 4 and type 2 (which is more evident when Hiraga adds that both languages actually understand IDEAS as being in a CONTAINER). Although her classification seems relevant for the research here (despite the fact it is related to translation), it is not adopted either. The reason, stated also by Hiraga herself as a possible shortcoming, is that these types depend on the level of abstraction ‘because it is the level of abstraction which decides whether two cultures share certain metaphorical concepts or not.’ (Hiraga 1991, 162) Also, she talks about ‘metaphorical’ expressions, but the CM can be also expressed by non-metaphorical expressions as is said in chapter 4.1. Additionally, the linguistic expressions are not of primary interest for me (what concerns the outcomes) and the focus in this thesis is on the conceptual metaphors.

Nevertheless, Hiraga’s note on ‘level of abstraction’ leads to the classification used in the present analysis. Kövecses (2010a, 44ff.) talks about ‘level of generality’ at which conceptual metaphors are found. In his opinion, there are specific-level metaphors like LIFE IS A JOURNEY, ARGUMENT IS WAR, or IDEAS ARE FOOD on one hand, and then generic-level metaphors like EVENTS ARE ACTIONS or GENERIC IS SPECIFIC, on the other. ‘As can be seen, concepts such as events, actions, generic, and specific are all generic-level concepts. They are defined by only a small number of properties, which is to say that they are characterized by extremely skeletal structures.’ (Kövecses 2010a, 45) Contrary to them, ‘[l]ife, journey, argument, war, ideas, and food are specific-level concepts. Schematic structures underlying them are filled in a detailed way’. (Kövecses 2010a, 44-45) I think the short description clearly shows what the levels are about.

The CMs identified by the analysis in this thesis are classified as specific-level metaphors because they are inferred from concrete linguistic expressions, which are

specific. These specific-level metaphors are then investigated and more general, superordinate concepts (for the source domains) are sought. The generic-level metaphors are established because they are more likely to be found ‘universal’ than the specific metaphors. Thus, similarities between Czech and English can be better observed.

2.5 Conceptual Metaphor Theory: some criticisms

This chapter draws predominantly on Kövecses’s article ‘Conceptual Metaphor Theory: some criticisms and alternative proposals’ (2008) and deals only with aspects relevant for the thesis.

One of the relevant criticisms is the level of schematicity at which CMs should be formulated. In other words, a level of abstraction discussed above – how general/specific should the metaphors be? Some critics of CMT, Kövecses claims, say that, e.g., the well-known metaphor THEORIES/ARGUMENTS ARE BUILDINGS is not correct since we can talk about *solid foundations* of a theory, but not about its *corridors* or *windows*. Thus, THEORIES/ARGUMENTS ARE BUILDINGS actually is not a metaphor the language users ‘live by’²⁷.

A similar problem was encountered also during the analysis in this thesis at the level of specific metaphors (see previous chapter). It was not resolved entirely, however, because of a simple reason: there are too few examples for each metaphor it is difficult to predict whether a given linguistic expression instantiates an established CM common in our everyday language use, or whether it belongs to the group of isolated, unsystematic cases. This has to be tested with a large-corpus study. Nevertheless, the CMs were formulated as specific as possible.

Second objections relevant here Kövecses (2008, 180) formulates like this: ‘The selection of the metaphors we use may also depend on who we are, that is, what our personal history is or what our long-lasting concerns or interests are.’ He provides an example of a metaphor THE EUROPEAN UNION AS AN ELECTRIC CIRCUIT, which one

²⁷ Of course, some novel metaphors can talk about *corridors* and *windows* of theories but these are not parts of everyday language use and of our conceptual system as CMT proposes.

citizen used in a Letter to the Editor. But the person was an electric engineer so this metaphor was motivated by personal characteristics and would not (very likely) be a common metaphor with other users of the language. Similar examples might of course happen also in the analysis in this thesis but, as in the case of the level of schematicity, it cannot be revealed unless a large-scale analysis is carried out.

A third relevant objection to CMT is not mentioned by Kövecses, but by Naomi Quinn. Quinn (1991, 91 in Rodríguez Márquez 2010, 33) claims that the work of Lakoff and Johnson ‘has been criticised because their work “relies on idealized cases, disconnected from the context of actual use in natural discourse”’. Although this thesis uses real data, it still leads to problems. Since the examples of CMs in Lakoff and Johnson (2003) are not authentic – as criticized – they are always clear and unproblematic. However, the real data is a slightly different matter and the examples provided by them are often not clear-cut, and there are several borderline cases. It is so due to their lexicalised form, or because the context did not provide sufficient clues as to whether they should, or should not belong to the concept of PURSUING SUCCESS. Also, the aspect of (more or less) subjective assessment of the linguistic expressions played a certain role.

3. The corpus

The corpus used for the analysis in this thesis has already been characterised with respect to the most important aspects in the Introduction, so only a brief repetition is presented. Some further aspects of the corpus and the genre of these types of texts are dealt with later on in this chapter.

Two of the texts are in Czech and two in English. One of the Czech and of the English texts are original texts and the other two are their translations. For it was not possible to determine which are source and which are target texts, the analysis could not be done in a translation-oriented manner and was changed into comparing conceptual metaphors in Czech and English without taking the translation problematics into account. All four texts are taken as examples of idiomatic language (reasons explained in the Introduction). The texts are opening letters of annual reports from years 2013 (Škoda Auto company) and 2014 (GE Money Bank). The characteristics of these companies would not be relevant for this thesis so they are not discussed. What might be of some use²⁸ (although probably not crucial), however, are the characteristics of the authors of the opening letters. Unfortunately, the authors are unknown (even though these letters are signed by a concrete person; explained later in this chapter).

The Czech texts contain 1426 words and the English texts contain 1358 words. It is a very small corpus not aimed at generating any general rules about conceptual metaphors in the two languages. Therefore, such corpus cannot be representative – ‘The importance of representativeness lies in the fact that it “refers to the extent to which a sample includes the full range of variability in a population.”’ (Biber 1993, 243 in Rodríguez Márquez 2010, 35) Rodríguez Márquez (ibid) further adds that ‘the corpus needs to include a range of data indicative of the language variety and genre that the researchers want to study. In this way, the findings derived from the corpus can be generalised in relation to such a population.’ As has been said, this thesis does not intend to present any general rules.

²⁸ For example, due to reasons illustrated with the metaphor THE EUROPEAN UNION AS AN ELECTRIC CIRCUIT in chapter 2.5.

The quote above suggests small corpora would be of no use. This is not true since Cameron and Deignan (2003) talk about the role even small corpora can play in metaphor research. The two authors combined a small and a large corpus to reduce the problems associated with each of the corpus: ‘Both types of corpora are potentially enormously rich sources of data for the metaphor analyst, but neither is without problems.’ (Cameron and Deignan 2003, 151) About the weak points of a small corpus they write:

For instance, the frequency and metaphorical use of a particular word form is inevitably influenced by the collection of data from a limited number of discourse events. This leads to the possibility that one particular speaker’s idiosyncratic use may dominate the citations for a particular word. Furthermore, words or metaphorical uses other than the most frequent may simply not occur, or occur too few times to make any generalization possible. (ibid)

The last objection has been dealt with. The problem of one speaker’s idiosyncratic use of particular word(s) is valid but this is an issue hardly to be solved without using a large corpus. However, in the case of opening letters of annual reports (called variously, e.g. the Letter to Shareholders) the issue can be reduced. The reason is that very often the author is not only one person. Zanola (2010, 13) writes:

As regards the Letter to Shareholders, normally, the person who signs the letter is also the author of the letter (Piotti 2009). However, this isn’t strictly true in most cases. In a typical company, the president or CEO might write a draft of the AR letter, send it to the chief financial officer, who makes revisions and sends it to the chief legal officer, who makes further revisions and sends it back to the president or CEO, who then makes final revisions. The chief legal officer may then do the final editing or someone else may do it. In some companies, the letter is drafted by the chief financial officer or the chief legal officer and then sent to the president or CEO for revision. In any event, the document is rarely the work of one person, but the product embodies the “corporate-speak” representative of the top management of the company.

More authors would thus reduce possible linguistic deviations.

Large corpus has its drawbacks, too. Cameron and Deignan (2003, 151) mention two: First, it provides the researcher with only an outline of the context; Second, some ‘patterns may be missed because the researcher usually begins by searching for particular linguistic forms’.

The solution of the drawbacks of both types of corpora, these authors argue, would be the combination of the two corpora within one study: a thorough investigation of a small corpus for clues that would be subsequently used as starting points in an investigation of a large corpus. In this respect, the analysis carried out here could be the first step after which further research could follow.²⁹

3.1 Opening letters and annual reports: genre perspective

In this subchapter, some aspects of genre analysis of annual reports and opening letters are discussed. Opening letters are sometimes referred to as ‘CEO’s letters’ or ‘Letters to Shareholders’, depending on the author.

‘From a linguistic point of view, the AR must be approached as a *genre*’ (Zanola 2010, 8; emphasis in the original). She is not the only one, of course, to say so. Genre analysis of annual reports is an area studied by many, e.g. Bhatia (2002; 2008) or Rutherford (2005). It also seems obvious that annual reports consist of various types of texts – in this respect, Zanola (2010, 2) talks about ‘interdisciplinarity’ and ‘contamination’: ‘The company ARs are among the most hybrid, heterogeneous and “contaminated” genres.’ Later (p. 4) she adds, talking about her paper, that ‘[b]y “contaminated genre” this paper refers to the hybrid nature of the AR texts, which may be considered as a blending of varied and multiple competencies.’

‘Blending of multiple competencies’ in annual reports could be understood as having multiple purposes, more precisely communicative purposes. Communicative purpose is an important aspect of the genre of annual reports. Bhatia (1993 in de Groot 2014, 240) observes that ‘[annual report] is a conventionalized text type that has been recognised over time to repeatedly fulfil particular communicative purposes within a given community of senders and receivers.’ Elsewhere Bhatia (2002, 10) classifies

²⁹ E.g., Wikberg (2008) illustrates different uses of corpus data for metaphor research.

annual reports among ‘mixed and embedded genres’, adding it is ‘either because they are designed to achieve a mix of communicative purposes, (...) or to communicate “private intentions” within the context of “socially recognised communicative purposes”’. What is, therefore, certain about ARs, is their variety and importance of communicative purposes³⁰.

The relevant purpose for the thesis is the promotional purpose typical for the opening letters. Hyland (1998, 225) observes that ‘CEOs typically seek to create a positive perception of themselves and their companies’. And Bhatia (2008, 172) adds that ‘[t]he rationale for writing this letter the way it has been written in such a positive tone is that businesses often downplay any indications of negative performance to highlight positive aspects for future growth.’ Bhatia also provides a seven-move structure typical of the opening letter, mentioning move 5 is not very common and certain variations are allowed (Bhatia 2008, 170):

Move 1: Looking back (overview of the review period)

Move 2: Identifying important themes (claims made)

Move 3: Elaboration on themes (evidence for claims)

Move 4: Expectations and promises (projections for future)

Move 5: Expressions of gratitude (thanks to staff and shareholders)

Move 6: Looking forward (revisiting Move 1)

Move 7: Positive and polite closing

Indeed, when applied to the texts analysed in this study, they were found to follow this pattern, to a greater or lesser extent. Additionally, Hynes (2004, 84) says that CEO’s letters must be credible and engender trust, which is supported also by Hyland (1998).

The opening letters belong to a narrative genre within ARs. As said in the Introduction, ‘[e]ven though the majority of studies regarding ARs have concentrated on financial aspects, nowadays, the narrative part is seen as an important area for

³⁰ The development of communicative purpose of annual reports is discussed (not in a very detailed manner), e.g., in de Groot 2014. ARs in the United States are studied by Hynes (2004), who provides characteristic of ARs with respect to their multiple purposes, and also gives some pieces of advice on writing an AR.

study and research.’ (Zanola 2010, 6) Studies on metaphors in the narratives are not irrelevant, either. The narrative nature of opening letters can ensure they are a good source of the conceptual metaphor since it is omnipresent. CM even exists in a specialized language (as mentioned, e.g., by Rojo López and Orts Llopis 2010) so a narrative genre with more ‘natural’ language could serve as a basis for such research as well.

What concerns the element of success and related concept of SUCCESS as investigated in this thesis, the link with promoting a good image of the company seems obvious. Rashed (2012, 164-165), who focuses on bank’s ARs, mentions the most important topics of CEO’s letters: importance and competitiveness, positive performances, and involvement and positive value topics. These topics, Rashed continues, are expressed by expressions like *first-rate, world-class, prestigious, leading, excellence, importance, robustness, maintain, position, profitable, successful, efficient, top-performing, improvement, efficiency, prosperity, progress, achieve, provide, outperform, attain* etc. These words clearly point to the concept of SUCCESS and some of them could be classified as metaphorical. Therefore, the investigation of opening letters for CMs with the target domain of PURSUING SUCCESS looks relevant.

Proposals for further research in annual reports are presented, e.g., by de Groot (2014, 241ff.), who identifies four areas of such researches: the interdependence between annual reports and other corporate communication genres, multimodality in annual reports, response to ARs, and the cultural background of annual report users.

4. The analysis: methodology

The chapter deals with the methodology of the analysis carried out in the thesis. It also deals with the identification of expressions that instantiate the underlying conceptual metaphors and in this respect follows the procedure proposed by so-called Pragglejaz group. Furthermore, it deals with the definition of a lexical unit for the purposes of the analysis here, with the usage of dictionaries during the Pragglejaz procedure and discusses related problems and deviations.

As already mentioned, there are two types of approaches to metaphor research: **top-down** and **bottom-up**. The top-down approach goes from a conceptual metaphor to the linguistic expressions and Rodríguez Márquez (2010, 49) describes it as follows: ‘This technique consists of investigating a particular conceptual metaphor, identifying lexical units from the source domain of such a conceptual metaphor by using a thesaurus, and then producing a concordance of all the lexical units identified for that source domain to find out their regular occurrence along with their linguistic context.’ This process is criticised by some (see Kövecses 2008) and is not adopted here since no concrete CM is presupposed.

What is followed in this thesis is the bottom-up approach, which goes in the opposite direction. It analyses a text, identifies metaphorical expressions in this text according to some well established protocol, and finally infers a conceptual metaphor. This is, of course, a very simplified description and it is elaborated later on.

Before the procedure of metaphor identification is dealt with, a few words about the level of the analysis are going to be said. Kövecses (2010a – in greater detail; 2008 – briefly in relation to the criticism of CMT) talks about three levels at which a metaphor analysis can be carried out: supraindividual, individual, and subindividual level.

The **supraindividual level**, the one at which this thesis operates, is described by Kövecses (2010a, 307) as follows:

‘This is the level at which most of the cognitive linguistic research is taking place. Researchers typically collect conventionalized metaphorical

expressions from dictionaries; thesauri; random other sources such as books, newspapers, magazines, and other news reports in the media; or their own “mental lexicon” as native speakers of a language. They then analyze these collections of conventionalized metaphorical expressions by grouping them into conceptual metaphors that have a concrete source and an abstract target domain.’

The next step in the analysis – if it were to move further – would be to proceed to the **individual level**. At this level it needs to be tested whether the conceptual metaphors identified at the supraindividual level are really those that people have in their conceptual systems (see Kövecses 2010a, 308). This is, of course, not my focus since it would require an extensive psychological study. An important note here is that not all of the CMs identified at the previous level must be used by every speaker of a given language – they usually choose only some of them, based on the communicative situation.

The last level – **subindividual** – is a level ‘where the metaphors receive their motivation, that is, the metaphors have a bodily and/or cultural basis’ (Kövecses 2008, 169). Kövecses (2010a, 309) adds that ‘this is a level that corresponds to the universal aspects of metaphor’.

This categorization of analyses reveals that the one carried out in this thesis is only the first step in a journey to the discovery of really interesting outcomes, the universal metaphors.

4.1 Metaphor identification procedure

Steen (2002b, 20) nicely sums up the following chapter:

‘What we as linguists have is language use and what we wish to end up with is a list of metaphors in the discourse which are grounded in a list of metaphorical mappings. The great difficulty of linguistic metaphor identification and analysis is how we get from the discourse to the list of mappings in a reliable fashion. This is the challenge of the entire

undertaking of beginning with metaphor identification in authentic discourse.’

The aim of the thesis is to discover the metaphors hidden in real texts. The way to find out should be somehow systematic and follow certain guidelines, so that the outcomes can be as objective and precise as possible, and be ready to be compared to other data that follow the same pattern. The last statement is actually the reason why such procedure should exist in the first place.

The procedure for metaphor identification is taken from Steen et al. (2010) – they call it simply ‘Metaphor Identification Procedure’, or **MIP**. This procedure, however, was devised by so-called **Pragglejaz group** in 2007 and Steen et al. (2010) elaborated it further into **MIPVU** (‘VU’ stand for ‘Vrije Universiteit’, the university in Amsterdam that the authors of MIPVU work at). Authors of MIPVU claim they made MIP more explicit and, therefore, reliable. The approach here uses MIP with some improvements made by MIPVU.

Steen (2002a, 386-387) rightly argues that the need for a method that would determine how to analyse metaphors in natural discourse emerged because of the conflict between theory and practice. Theories typically present clear-cut examples – and CMT is no exception – which are hard to find in natural discourse. In addition, real analysis typically does not start (unless we adopt a top-down approach) with a predefined metaphor, but takes a real text which is then examined in order to reveal the ‘hidden’ CMs. This examination should, therefore, be guided by some rules.

Such method is the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) devised by Pragglejaz group³¹ who felt the need for such a procedure. The original MIP was devised in order to ‘minimise measurer bias’, i.e. to ensure better comparable results from various researchers and different kinds of texts (see Steen 2002a for more details about the reasons behind establishing MIP). The original method was also aimed at identification of *metaphorical* language expressions only, so direct metaphors³² (like

³¹ The name of the group consists of the first names of its members: Peter Crisp, Ray Gibbs, Alice Deignan, Gerard Steen, Graham Low, Lynne Cameron, Elena Semino, Joe Grady, Alan Cienki, and Zoltán Kövecses. These researchers cover areas such as linguistics, cognitive linguistics, stylistics, psycholinguistics, and applied linguistics.

³² Metaphor-related words are usually used indirectly. However, there may be direct or implicit language use that still triggers the cross-domain mapping – therefore, it is classified as a metaphor in

simile, allegory, etc.) or implicit metaphors³³, would not be identified by MIP. For that reason (and others) the MIPVU was developed. Other researchers can then adapt the MIP(VU) for their specific purposes, like Rodríguez Márquez (2010) did when she used it for a translation-oriented work with a large electronic corpus.

It could be also mentioned here that Steen (2009) used a similar 5-step identification procedure and illustrated it on an analysis of a poem *Now Sleeps the Crimson Petal* by Lord Alfred Tennyson. Steen's procedure, unlike the original MIP and like the MIPVU, included the direct metaphors as well. All three procedures (MIP, MIPVU, and the 5-step method from Steen 2009) are illustrated below for a comparison.

Now the procedures are going to be presented and relevant aspects are going to be explained. Moreover, differences between these procedures and the analysis carried out in this thesis are going to be discussed.

The first procedure to be introduced is the original **MIP** devised by the Pragglejaz group in 2007. It is illustrated below (from Steen et al. 2010, 5-6) along with a concrete example (1) from the analysed texts in this thesis:

(1) *Ladies and gentlemen, 2013 was all about ŠKODA's biggest-ever model offensive: Within just one year, we presented eight new or completely revised models to the public – more than ever before in our 118-year history.* (ŠA_en)

1. Read the entire text/discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.

The company was successful in 2013 because of the steps it took to achieve this success.

2. Determine the lexical units in the text/discourse.³⁴

Offensive

the cognitive point of view. The direct use is, for example, simile, allegory, analogy and others (see Steen et al. 2010, 57ff.). An example of implicit language use provided by Steen: "Naturally, to embark on such a step is not necessarily to succeed immediately in realising *it*." Here *step* is related to metaphor, and *it* receives a code for implicit metaphor." (Steen et al. 2010, 15)

³³ Implicit metaphors are not taken into account in this thesis since it was assumed this would make the analysis more complicated (and less clear), it would not reveal new metaphors, and only increase the number of analysed metaphors too much. The last reason then somewhat hinders any quantification of results, but since a possible quantification would be only illustrative and not aimed to formulate any general rules, this is not considered a fatal problem.

³⁴ For the sake of demonstration, only one of possibly more metaphors is analysed.

3.

- a. For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, i.e. how it applies to an entity, relation or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.

A set of steps taken in order to boost the company's success

- b. For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be:

- more concrete; what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste;
- related to bodily action;
- more precise (as opposed to vague);
- historically older.

Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.

Basic meaning: 'a major military attack' (Macmillan)

- c. If the lexical unit has a more basic current/contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.

The contextual meaning does contrast with the basic meaning and can be understood in comparison with it. (To take the steps in order to boost success of the company is like to attack in a war in order to win.)

4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical.

The LU is metaphorical.

As has been said, this procedure only identifies **indirectly used expressions** which point to a metaphor. Also, historical metaphor is not identified as metaphorical by

MIP and neither is in this thesis. The authors suggest (Steen et al. 2010, 7)³⁵ that the metaphor is understood as ‘metaphorical to some language users’, it is a relational term. The authors also emphasize that ‘[t]here is no claim that any of the metaphorically used words identified by the procedure are also actively realized as metaphorical mappings in the individual mind.’ (p. 9) This is also something not investigated by the thesis since it is obvious such a small corpus like the one used here could not, by any means, provide sufficient clues.

The MIP looks simple, but it actually hides several obstacles. First, the text is read in order to be understood. Then, the first possible problem arises – determination of lexical units that will be subsequently analysed with respect to their basic and contextual meaning.

Metaphoricity may be found, as Steen et al. observe, at many levels: morphology, individual words, syntax... It is therefore better to determine only one level at which the analysis is to be carried out. In MIP it is the level of a word, or a lexical unit, which is preferred, because ‘most words may be assumed to activate concepts in memory which postulate referents in discourse’ (p. 12) and this is adopted also in the thesis. The lexical unit in the thesis is a word, or a phrase. However, sometimes the lexical unit is stretched to include a clause (e.g. in ŠA_cs: *Jsme na dobré cestě stát se...*³⁶). The criterion for the establishment of a lexical unit was a semantic aspect and a certain degree of subjective assessment (based on individual ‘sense of language’). If a larger lexical unit can be analysed as belonging to one concept, it is assessed as a whole – it would not make sense to dissect it into individual words, because what matters are the underlying concepts.

As has been said, MIP accounts only for a direct language use. For that reason, another procedure was identified by Steen et al. (2010, 14-15) **to include also the direct metaphors**. It is presented here along with a real example (2) taken from the analysis of this thesis:

³⁵ Until stated otherwise, one source, namely Steen et al. 2010, is used to describe the methods. It is going to be referred to only with a page number to make it simpler.

³⁶ English literal translation: *We are on a good way to become...*

(2) *We must remain agile and adaptable: not a tanker, but a nimble speedboat, able to respond to faster-changing market demands in the best way possible.* (ŠA_cs)

1. Find local referent and topic shifts.³⁷

We must remain agile and adaptable: not a tanker, but a nimble speedboat, able to respond to faster-changing market demands in the best way possible.

2. Test whether the incongruous words are to be integrated within the overall referential and/or topical framework by means of some form of comparison.

Yes: we must be like a nimble speedboat.

3. Test whether the comparison is nonliteral or cross-domain.

We – the company → the domain of business

Nimble speedboat → the domain of water transportation

It is a cross-domain comparison.

4. Test whether the comparison can be seen as some form of indirect talk about the local or main referent or topic of the text. (If it is not, we might be dealing with a digression.)

Yes, we talk about the need for the company to be as a nimble speedboat, indicating the company should be nimble and agile in the way the boat is (when it moves).

5. If the findings for tests 2, 3, and 4 are positive, then a word should be identified as (part of) a direct form of metaphor.

The lexical unit nimble speedboat can be classified as a direct metaphor.

(There is not a further step that would infer a concrete conceptual metaphor but this is going to be dealt with later.)

If we get back to the previous MIP, **step 3** determines the contextual and basic meaning of a given lexical unit (LU). This may be a problematic point. MIP, as well as MIPVU – whose method is going to be presented later – uses **dictionaries** to

³⁷ Again, for the sake of demonstration, only one of possibly more metaphors is analysed.

establish these meanings (Steen et al. 2010, 16ff.). They use *The Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* and *The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* as a second-opinion dictionary. Occasionally, *Oxford English Dictionary* (in MIP) is used because of its etymology. The reason for these dictionaries is that they are based on corpora and are current. For this thesis, the dictionaries used were *Macmillan online dictionary* and *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* as a second-opinion source. Here, a problem occurs since Rodríguez Márquez (2010, 134) suggests, when comparing two languages, to use similar, corpora-based dictionaries in both of the languages. In Czech, however, there is not such a quality dictionary, so 'Internetová jazyková příručka'³⁸ was used. Contextual meaning can be, unless the LU is novel, which is very rare, found in a dictionary. The basic meaning, however, is sometimes difficult to find. 'Basic senses are the most concrete and human-oriented senses that can be distinguished. Contrary to what is suggested by MIP, we [MIPVU] have left older senses (as listed in for instance the Oxford English Dictionary) outside consideration when determining basic senses. This is because they are commonly not accessible as relevant senses to the contemporary user of English (...).' (Steen et al. 2010, 17)

This suggests **etymology dictionaries** should not be used (at least in MIPVU). This is another point where the analysis presented in the thesis deviates from the MIPVU suggestions since etymology dictionaries are used in the thesis. Etymology dictionaries are not used, however, to determine the oldest meaning possible. They are used only as a support for the determining of the basic meaning in cases of lexicalized expressions. These would probably not be included if MIPVU was followed completely, but it seemed such expressions could contribute to the analysis. Therefore, if a word (because it is not applicable to larger units) is lexicalized but still seems related to its root (the root can still be *quite well* observed in the word), it is looked up in an etymology dictionary³⁹. If the seemingly visible root is confirmed by the dictionary, it is included in the analysis. Also, if a basic meaning cannot be resolved with a 'normal' dictionary, the etymology dictionary may help as to which of

³⁸ An online language guide of the Czech language, available at <http://prirucka.ujc.cas.cz/>, which also contains *Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost* [A dictionary of the standard Czech language].

³⁹ For English: etymonline.com; for Czech: *Český Etymologický Slovník* (Rejzek 2001) as a main source and *Stručný Etymologický Slovník Jazyka Českého Se Zvláštním Zřetelem K Slovíům Kulturním A Cizím* (Holub and Lyrer 1978) and *Etymologický Slovník Jazyka Českého* (Kopečný and Holub 1952) as secondary sources.

the meanings listed in the current dictionary is older. For more on the use of dictionaries in MIPVU see Krennmayr 2008.

As has been said earlier in this chapter, some LUs in the thesis are multi-word. This raises a problem of analysing their basic and contextual meanings since there is no dictionary to determine them. In such cases, their meanings, both contextual (which is not that difficult to determine) and basic, are guessed and these cases are marked as ‘assumptions’ and then separated in the outcomes.

‘Finally, whether contextual and basic senses are distinct enough (...) can also be reliably measured, by their degree of independence as separate sense descriptions in the dictionary.’ (Steen et al. 2010, 17) This is not always true, but when contextual and basic meanings are established, it is usually not that difficult to determine their distinctness – it includes a certain amount of subjectivity on the part of the analyser, but this is something that does not seem to be resolved by any rule.

MIPVU adds an extra category, also adopted in the thesis, namely ‘**WIDLII**’ – ‘When In Doubt, Leave It In’ (p. 19). It is a category with borderline cases which the analysts could not agree on with respect to their metaphoricity.

Another special type of LUs which appear in the analysed texts are **specialized terms**. These are discussed by Steen et al. (2010, 111ff.) as well. In their terms, these are not included. The reason is that in MIP(VU), who is taken into account is the *general reader* without specialized knowledge, and neither specialized dictionaries are used. Therefore, if the terms are not found in general dictionaries, they are not included. However, they add:

‘...if the contextual sense of a specialized term is not in the dictionary, but there is a sense that fulfils our criteria of being basic, and that can be understood by comparison to the (assumed) contextual sense, we mark the word as a borderline case of metaphor (‘WIDLII’)—‘borderline’ because we have not checked the contextual sense against a specialist dictionary.’ (p. 112)

The thesis does not take specialized terms into account since they seem to be too special cases and would produce CMs that people ‘do not live by’. Similar case is with

idioms (see Kövecses 2008, 171) – which are not included, either, also due to the fact they are not part of the analysed concept of PURSUING SUCCESS.

Some expressions are included only because they are in connection to some other word/phrase that makes them belong to the given concept. There is an example (3) from the analysed texts:

(3) *A year where we started to see the benefits of the strategy we put in place back in 2013 to diversify our business focus.* (GE_en)

Strategy is interpreted as something beneficial (for success) only because we saw its *benefits*. If there were *disastrous consequences* instead, the strategy would not be included. Thus we can show the huge **importance of context/co-text**, which is always taken into account.

MIP for metaphorical expressions as well as direct metaphors was presented, and **MIPVU** is to be presented next. It is as follows (Steen et al. 2010, 25-26):

1. Find metaphor-related words (MRWs) by examining the text on a word-by-word basis.
2. When a word is used indirectly and that use may potentially be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping from a more basic meaning of that word, mark the word as metaphorically used (MRW).
3. When a word is used directly and its use may potentially be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping to a more basic referent or topic in the text, mark the word as direct metaphor (MRW, direct).
4. When words are used for the purpose of lexico-grammatical substitution, such as third person personal pronouns, or when ellipsis occurs where words may be seen as missing, as in some forms of co-ordination, and when a direct or indirect meaning is conveyed by those substitutions or ellipses that may potentially be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping from a more basic meaning, referent, or topic, insert a code for implicit metaphor (MRW, implicit).

5. When a word functions as a signal that a cross-domain mapping may be at play, mark it as a metaphor flag (MFlag).
6. When a word is a new-formation coined, examine the distinct words that are its independent parts according to steps 2 through 5.

The MIPVU aims to include all expressions that could possibly be realizations of a CM. This is good, but the above proposed schema is quite vague. Nevertheless, it may be taken as a general draft and include the previous MIP and the procedure for identification of direct metaphors (illustrated with example (2)). The original MIP would be applied to step 2 of MIPVU, and the second procedure would be applied to step 3. All in all, all the procedures have a crucial point which determines the metaphoricity and which may pose the biggest problems, and that is the determining of contextual and basic meaning and their contrast.

There is one last deviation in the analysis in this thesis, namely that it adopts **one additional step: to infer the underlying conceptual metaphor**. MIP(VU) does not aim to identify a concrete CM – in which the thesis is predominantly interested in – because Steen et al. (2010, 8) claim it is not that simple and it is a source of common disagreement among analysts. This may be true; nevertheless, it needs to be done in order to arrive at some conclusions presupposed in the Introduction.

The step of identifying the CM is adopted by Rodríguez Márquez (2010), for instance, although she does not state any detailed procedure for the process. Steen (2009) in his analysis of a poem, uses a slightly different method for the whole metaphor identification, and despite not implementing the step of the identification of a concrete CM, it seems the CM would be better inferred from that procedure. He focuses also on direct metaphors, unlike MIP, and transforms words into propositions in which open comparisons are identified, then analogies are identified and finally also cross-domain mappings, i.e. what aspects are mapped from the source onto the target. However, he uses an elaborate system of notation which is not relevant here, so more comprehensive explanation of this procedure is not

provided (for that, see Steen 2002a, 2002b, 2009), only his example of such analysis (Steen 2009, 202)⁴⁰:

Text	<i>Now sleeps the crimson petal</i>
1. Identification of metaphor-related words	Sleeps
2. Identification of propositions	P1 (SLEEP _s PETAL _t) P2 (MOD P1 NOW _t) P3 (MOD PETAL _t CRIMSON _t)
3. Identification of open comparison	SIM { $\exists F \exists a$ [F (CRIMSON PETAL)] _t [SLEEP (a)] _s }
4. Identification of analogical structure	SIM {[BE-INACTIVE (CRIMSON PETAL)] _t [SLEEP (HUMAN)] _s }
5. Identification of cross-domain mapping	SLEEP > BE-INACTIVE HUMAN > CRIMSON PETAL <i>inferences:</i> GOAL OF SLEEP > GOAL OF BE-INACTIVE: REST TIME OF SLEEP > TIME OF BE-INACTIVE: NIGHT

Table 1: 5-step metaphor identification by Steen (2009)

Step 6 could then infer a metaphor, which in this case would be TO BE INACTIVE IS TO SLEEP and CRIMSON PETAL IS HUMAN.

For the sake of completeness, it should be also mentioned that the analysis is partially restricted from the very beginning. It focuses only on areas/phrases/lexical units that are potentially linked to the concept of PURSUING SUCCESS, and further assesses only these with respect to metaphoricity; the analysis in order to reveal metaphoricity is, therefore, not done on a word-by-word basis, but selects only relevant areas in the text. However, the whole texts are read in order for the context to be understood.

To conclude about the above procedures, it should be pointed out that all these procedures happen only in the analyst's head. And that is exactly the case with the analysis carried out for the purposes of the thesis. Only in cases where the analyst is

⁴⁰ In Steen 2009, the author presents his metaphor identification in relation to literary texts, namely poetry, but claims its application is much wider.

not sure might it be convenient to write it down, or to clearly realize (or possibly visualize) these steps (in MIP, MIPVU, or the other procedures).

4.2 Defining the target domain: some clarifications

The target domain has so far been characterized as PURSUING SUCCESS. There are several specifications that need to be made in connection with this.

First specification, relating to the whole **format of CM**, is that the present tense is used and in the form of to-infinitives. So, for instance, a CM is written in the form TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO MOVE and not PURSUING SUCCESS IS MOVING. It seems better to have both domains in the same form and the to-infinitive seemed more suitable.

Secondly: The concrete **CM** is inferred – with respect to this thesis – **as specific as possible**. However, the target domain (PURSUING SUCCESS) is pre-established so in this case it might actually not be so. The target domain is more or less generalized and I am aware of that. It's because with a uniform domain, the results can be compared better. Below is an example of such generalization:

(4) *We have successfully entered new commercial banking sectors with high growth potential, including commercial real estate. (GE_en)*

Enter new commercial banking sectors is taken as a way of pursuing success, but if the most specific domain/concept should be used, it could be, e.g., TO START OPERATING/DOING BUSINESS IN A NEW SECTOR or something similar. This is a problem associated with the level of abstraction as discussed in chapter 2. Here, in the target domain, it is resolved by establishing the one concept (PURSUING SUCCESS).

Thirdly, the **boundaries** of the target domain need to be established. In the chapter dealing with annual reports and opening letters, it was said that the communicative purpose relevant for this analysis is the promotional purpose. This is related, then, to the fact that the authors of opening letters tend to emphasize the successful and positive side of the company. Therefore, almost everything in the opening letter is somehow linked to the concept of SUCCESS. For that reason, a boundary is needed.

Only lexical units directly (more or less) linked to the target domain are included, and those not clearly related or very indirectly, are excluded. It is certain these criteria are to a certain extent subjective, but it seemed better to have these criteria rather than have none.

Therefore, what is included is mainly the active effort of the company, its management and employees, aimed at desired progress of the company. This includes also when the company's revenues increases, when product range is extended, new clients are brought in, etc. Also the means by which the company achieves success, like a good strategy, is included. The result – the achievement of success – is included as well, of course. However, if this means has some positive characteristic which helps to pursue success (like a *good* strategy), and if this characteristic is metaphorically expressed, this is not included because it is considered to be too indirect for the given target domain. On the other hand, if a company (and by this also its employees are meant) has qualities necessary or highly desired for the pursuit of success, these qualities are included in the analysis. The format of the target domain (and the whole CM for that matter) in this cases is then changed into the form **TO BE IN DESIRED CONDITION**. It is included because it seems closely related to the pursuit of success. Another set of included expressions deals with desired/successful results of the activities performed by the company, e.g. *ŠKODA Octavia, která se setkala s velmi kladným přijetím* (in ŠA_cs) [*ŠKODA Octavia*⁴¹ *car which was very well accepted*] (my translation). The last type of expressions included is the way the company overcomes obstacles while pursuing success. This is a slight digression, but it is a part of the way to reach success so it is relevant.

What is *not* analysed is how the company is portrayed, i.e. what entity stands for the company. For example, if the CM inferred is **TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO GROW**, then the company may be seen as a living thing able to grow. The thesis is not interested in metaphors such as those.

There is one more variation in the target domain mentioned above, which is **TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS**. The target domain **TO PURSUE SUCCESS** is used for the activities done by the company/its employees – rather active effort, e.g. *we will maintain this pace, we continued to lay the foundation*. Conversely, **TO MAKE DESIRED**

⁴¹ Here it is not the company, but its product. Still, it was included, but as a borderline case.

PROGRESS is used for cases of rather passive pursuit of success, e.g. when *the income or deliveries increase, the products are well accepted* and so on. Although these classifications might not be sometimes clearly distinguished, it is still believed to be convenient. In the results, there is no separate classification of the three variations of the target domain.

Since the boundaries of the target domain are to a certain extent **subjective**, there are cases which I was not sure about as to whether to include them or not. These are **borderline cases** which are marked by underlining, but in the overview of all results they are not separated and are included along with all the other types of metaphors.

What are treated as a separate group, however, are so-called **'WIDLII'** (When In Doubt, Leave It In) cases (already discussed). WIDLII cases seem to show a cross-domain mapping but a concrete CM cannot be identified.

To make the picture complete, the last special group of metaphors within the identified ones are so-called 'assumptions' discussed earlier.

In all the cases assessed in the thesis, apart from the procedure of metaphor identification, certain sensitivity for language is needed and made use of. Also, context plays an important role and the focus is not that much on the words themselves, but on the semantics. Due to these criteria, it is possible that the same expressions are once included, but excluded some other time (e.g. *ramp-up* in ŠA_en).

5. The analysis: results

The chapter presents the outcomes of the analysis described in the previous sections. The focus was on the concrete conceptual metaphors and their comparison in the two languages involved, Czech and English. All the CMs are formulated in English so it is easier to compare them in various ways.

It was presumed there are more CMs with the given target domain, and that is indeed true. The number of identified metaphors was 67 in the Czech texts and 48 in the English texts (borderline cases included, underlined in the tables below). Additionally, there were also ‘WIDLII’ cases, and ‘assumptions’ as was suggested in the theoretical part: In the Czech texts, 3 WIDLII (2 of which were instantiations of the same word) and 9 assumptions were identified; in the English texts, there were 3 WIDLII cases and 5 assumptions. Altogether, there were **135 metaphors identified** (or at least assumed, in the case of WIDLII): 72 in Czech and 63 in English.

The reasons why there were more metaphors identified in Czech than in English could be:

1. I am a native Czech speaker; therefore, the Czech metaphors are spotted easily (despite the use of dictionaries in English).
2. The translations could play their role – they may contain more or fewer metaphors because of the translators’ incompetence (although these translations should not be of poor quality, as argued earlier).
3. Czech is more metaphorical than English.
4. Idiosyncrasies of the texts.

What is the right or main reason, however, cannot be certainly stated.

The main aim of the analysis was to discover the underlying conceptual metaphors in Czech and English with respect to a specific target domain. These metaphors would then be, in accordance with Kövecses (2010a), marked as specific-level metaphors because they are inferred as specific as possible. However, to reveal similar patterns in the two languages (if there are any), these metaphors should be generalized into so-called generic-level metaphors. This is what *Table 2* and *Table 3* are presenting.

Table 2 contains all the metaphors from the Czech texts (apart from the assumptions and WIDLII, these are treated separately – the same with the English metaphors), and *Table 3* from the English texts. The metaphors are presented in two tables due to space restrictions. The specific-level Ms are ordered (where it was possible) according to the number of occurrences (if the given metaphor occurs more than once, the number of occurrences is in the brackets). But some of the multiple occurrences (typically two) were only due to the repetition of the same linguistic expressions. ‘Special’ cases, like the overcoming of obstacles (which was not common in the texts), are usually positioned at the end of each category (and are commented on later). The underlined expressions are the borderline cases. If a generic-level metaphor is underlined, then all the specific-level metaphors are also borderline. If only some of the specific-level metaphors are underlined, then only these are borderline and not the rest in the group. The examples in the third column are taken from the analysed texts in whose language they are written. The numbers of specific-level metaphors and the examples correspond.

Generic-level metaphors	Specific-level metaphors	Examples from the texts
TO BE (POTENTIALLY) SUCCESSFUL / TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE PHYSICALLY STRONG	1. TO BE (POTENTIALLY) SUCCESSFUL / TO BE IN DESIRED CONDITION IS TO BE PHYSICALLY STRONG (4) 2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BECOME PHYSICALLY STRONG(ER) (2) 3. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PHYSICALLY SUPPORT [STH BENEFICIAL] 4. TO BE (POTENTIALLY) SUCCESSFUL IS TO BE A PHYSICALLY STRONG PARTNER 5. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO LET SB SUPPORT YOU PHYSICALLY	1. Skupina GEM je <i>silnou</i> českou bankou... 2. Naše značka <i>neustále nabírá na síle</i> ... 3. Pokračujeme v <i>podpoře</i> inovací, které... 4. ...být <i>silným partnerem</i> všem našim klientům... 5. Na závěr bych chtěl poděkovat (...) <i>za jejich podporu</i> ...
<u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO FILL UP [A CONTAINER]</u>	<i>The same</i>	To nám pomáhá <i>plnit</i> regulační a legislativní požadavky...
TO PURSUE	1. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE	1. <i>Strategie</i> z roku 2013 (...) se

<p>SUCCESS IS TO ENGAGE IN FIGHTING</p>	<p>ABLE TO COMMAND SUCCESSFULLY IN BATTLE (3)</p> <p>2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO ATTACK IN BATTLE</p> <p>3. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO ATTACK IN BATTLE AND WIN</p>	<p>ukázala být úspěšná...</p> <p>2. ...rok 2013 se (...) odehrál celý ve znamení dosud největší modelové <i>ofenzívy</i>...</p> <p>3. V roce 2014 se na silnicích <i>projeví v plné síle výsledky naší modelové ofenzívy</i>...</p>
<p>TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS / TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO MOVE</p>	<p>1. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS/TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO GROW (UPWARDS)</u> (8)</p> <p>2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO WALK (5)</p> <p>3. TO PURSUE SUCCESS/TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO REACH (ONE'S HAND) AND TOUCH [THE DESIRED GOAL] (5)</p> <p>4. TO PURSUE SUCCESS / TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO BECOME WIDER (4)</p> <p>5. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO MOVE UP (3)</p> <p>6. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PHYSICALLY ENTER [DESIRED PLACES] (2)</p> <p>7. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO (PHYSICALLY) TOUCH [THE DESIRED GOAL] WHICH IS UPWARDS</p> <p>8. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO FOLLOW A PATH</p> <p>9. <u>TO BE IN DESIRED CONDITION IS TO BE WIDER</u></p> <p>10. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO REACH A DESTINATION (ON ONE'S WAY)</u></p> <p>11. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO WALK TOWARDS [CUSTOMERS] TO MEET THEM</u></p> <p>12. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE ON A JOURNEY</p> <p>13. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO MOVE ON WHILE MAINTAINING PACE</p> <p>14. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE A NIMBLE SPEEDBOAT</p> <p>15. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE ABLE TO COME CLOSER [TO WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE]</p> <p>16. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO GET</p>	<p>1. Vklady klientů činí 96,9 miliardy Kč, <i>vrostly</i> o 3,3 miliardy...</p> <p>2. Reakce na tento <i>krok</i> byly velmi pozitivní.</p> <p>3. Díky kombinaci (...) se nám v roce 2014 podařilo <i>dosáhnout</i> skvělých finančních výsledků</p> <p>4. <i>rozšíření</i> kapacit v České republice</p> <p>5. V roce 2013 se značka ŠKODA podařilo <i>navýšit</i> svůj podíl...</p> <p>6. V komerčním bankovníctví jsme úspěšně <i>vstoupili do</i> nových odvětví s vysokým potenciálem růstu.</p> <p>7. Celková aktiva vzrostla o 7 % a <i>dosáhla výše</i> 144,1 miliardy Kč.</p> <p>8. Vstup banky do odvětví financování komerčních nemovitostí byl dalším strategickým <i>milníkem</i>...</p> <p>9. S tím přichází i <i>širší</i> nabídka produktů...</p> <p>10. ...přičemž jsme v tomto regionu také <i>docílili</i> navýšení...</p> <p>11. ...abychom jim v budoucnosti mohli i nadále <i>vycházet vstříc</i>.</p> <p>12. <i>Jsme na dobré cestě</i> stát se...</p> <p>13. Budeme i nadále <i>postupovat</i> <i>současným tempem</i>...</p> <p>14. Nesmíme se chovat jako tanker, <i>nýbrž jako obratný závodní člun</i>...</p> <p>15. Nebylo by to však možné bez pozitivního <i>přístupu</i>...</p> <p>16. ...za vůli neustále <i>překonávat vlastní limity</i>.</p> <p>17. Díky jejich pracovnímu nasazení se nám v roce 2013 <i>podařilo překonat</i> <i>nemalé</i></p>

	<p>BEYOND ONE'S DELIMITED SPACE (PHYSICALLY)</p> <p>17. TO DEAL WITH DIFFICULTIES (WHILE PURSUING SUCCESS) IS TO GET OVER TRAPS (ON ONE'S WAY)</p> <p>18. TO OVERCOME DIFFICULTIES IS TO LEAVE [THE DIFFICULTIES] BEHIND YOU</p> <p>19. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO MOVE DOWN</p>	<p><i>nástrahy...</i></p> <p>18. ...v souvislosti s klíčovými trhy se přesto začínají objevovat příznaky toho, <i>že to nejhorší mají již za sebou.</i></p> <p>19. Úvěrové ztráty činily 1,4 miliardy Kč, <i>poklesly</i> o 53 %...</p>
<u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE UNIFIED</u>	TO BE IN DESIRED CONDITION IS TO BE INTACT/COMPLETE	<i>závazek integrity</i>
<u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO LIMIT ONE'S REACH</u>	<i>The same</i>	...výrazně <i>omezit rozsah</i> aktivit své divize GE Capital...
TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BUILD	TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BUILD STRONG FOUNDATIONS	Rozsáhlými investicemi v průběhu roku 2013 <i>jsme si vybudovali solidní základ</i> pro budoucí <i>růst.</i>
<u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE INVOLVED IN INTERACTION</u>	<p>1. TO DEAL WITH CHALLENGES/CIRCUMSTANCES IS TO RESPOND IN INTERACTION</p> <p>2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE WELCOMED WARMLY (2)</p> <p>3. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PUT [STH DESIRABLE] IN FRONT OF [THE CUSTOMERS] (2)</p> <p>4. TO BE SUCCESSFUL IS TO RECEIVE (BACK) A BIG ECHO</p>	<p>1. ...musíme umět optimálně <i>reagovat</i> na stále rychleji se měnící požadavky trhu.</p> <p>2. ...ŠKODA Octavia, která <i>se setkala s velmi kladným přijetím...</i></p> <p>3. Během jediného roku jsme veřejnosti <i>představili</i> osm (...) modelů...</p> <p>4. Nové vozy <i>se setkaly s velkou odezvou...</i></p>
<u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO GET LOUD ECHO</u>	<i>The same</i>	...ŠKODA Octavia, která <i>se setkala (...)</i> <i>se silným ohlasem...</i>
TO BE SUCCESSFUL IS TO SHINE	<i>The same</i>	Nabízí se nám řada neobsazených automobilových segmentů, ve kterých by ŠKODA mohla přesvědčivě <i>zazářit...</i>

Table 2: Overview of conceptual metaphors identified in the Czech texts

Generic-level metaphors	Specific-level metaphors	Examples from the texts
TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO ENGAGE IN FIGHTING	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE ABLE TO COMMAND SUCCESSFULLY IN BATTLE (2) 2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO ATTACK IN BATTLE (2) 3. TO DEAL WITH DIFFICULTIES (WHILE PURSUING SUCCESS) IS TO DEFEAT [THE DIFFICULTIES] 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ...we started to see the benefits of the <i>strategy</i>... 2. ...we will <i>bring the full power of our model offensive</i> to the roads... 3. ...we were able to <i>overcome</i> the considerable challenges...
<u>TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO BECOME DIVERSE</u>	<i>The same</i>	...to <i>diversify</i> our business focus...
TO BE (POTENTIALLY) SUCCESSFUL IS TO BE PHYSICALLY STRONG	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TO BE (POTENTIALLY) SUCCESSFUL / TO BE IN DESIRED CONDITION IS TO BE PHYSICALLY STRONG (5) 2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO LET SB SUPPORT YOU PHYSICALLY (2) 3. TO BECOME SUCCESSFUL IS TO BECOME PHYSICALLY STRONG 4. TO BE (POTENTIALLY) SUCCESSFUL IS TO BE A PHYSICALLY STRONG PARTNER 5. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PHYSICALLY (BETTER) SUPPORT [STH YOU NEED FOR YOUR SUCCESS]</u> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ...and once again confirms our Company's <i>strength</i>. 2. Finally, I would like to end where I started by thanking our employees (...) for their <i>support</i>... 3. Our brand is increasingly <i>gathering strength</i>... 4. ...focus on being a <i>strong</i> and responsible <i>partner</i> for all our clients... 5. ...and better <i>support</i> our existing clients' needs.
TO PURSUE SUCCESS / TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO MOVE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO MOVE UP (4) 2. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO BECOME BIGGER (3) 3. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS / TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO GROW (3) 4. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO GROW BEYOND ONE'S DELIMITED SPACE 5. TO BE MORE SUCCESSFUL IS TO BE TALLER 6. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO MOVE FORWARD 7. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO REACH (ONE'S HAND) AND TOUCH [THE DESIRED GOAL] 8. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE ON A JOURNEY 9. TO BE IN DESIRED CONDITION 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CZK 4.3 billion of Consolidated Net Income, <i>up</i> 11% over 2013 2. ...<i>expansion</i> of capacity... 3. ...the delivery of 60,000 vehicles to customers in 2013 – a <i>growth</i> of 0.6%... 4. ...their willingness to constantly <i>grow beyond their limits</i>. 5. ...deliveries to customers were 6.6% <i>higher</i> year-on-year... 6. ...<i>make significant progress</i> across the board. 7. ...before we <i>reach</i> new heights again. 8. We <i>are</i> well <i>on our way</i> to become... 9. ...as a way to <i>broaden</i> our product range...

	<p>IS TO BE WIDER</p> <p>10. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO BECOME BIGGER IN AMOUNT</p> <p>11. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BRING [STH BENEFICIAL] WITH YOU</u></p> <p>12. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PHYSICALLY ENTER [A DESIRED PLACE]</u></p> <p>13. <u>TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO CLIMB UP</u></p> <p>14. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO WALK</u></p> <p>15. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO WALK ON WHILE MAINTAINING PACE</u></p> <p>16. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE A NIMBLE SPEEDBOAT</p> <p>17. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO MOVE DOWN</p>	<p>10. 27.8% Group Capital Adequacy <i>nearly double</i> the regulatory requirement</p> <p>11. ...<i>bring</i> new commercial clients to our business...</p> <p>12. We have successfully <i>entered</i> new commercial banking sectors...</p> <p>13. ...twelve international production <i>ramp-ups</i>...</p> <p>14. the dynamic <i>pace</i> of development</p> <p>15. We will <i>maintain this pace</i>...</p> <p>16. We must remain (...) <i>a nimble speedboat</i>...</p> <p>17. CZK 1.4 billion Credit Losses, <i>down</i> 53%...</p>
<u>TO BE IN DESIRED CONDITION IS TO BE INTACT/COMPLETE</u>	<i>The same</i>	...our core focus on delivering with <i>integrity</i> ...
TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BUILD	TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BUILD FOUNDATIONS (OF A BUILDING)	...we continued to <i>lay the foundation</i> ...
<u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE INVOLVED IN INTERACTION</u>	<p>1. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PUT [STH DESIRABLE] IN FRONT OF [THE CUSTOMERS] (2)</p> <p>2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE WELCOMED NICELY</p> <p>3. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO ENCOUNTER [STH DESIRED] (2)</p>	<p>1. ...we <i>presented</i> eight new or completely revised models...</p> <p>2. ...ŠKODA Octavia, which was particularly <i>well received</i>...</p> <p>3. ...we would have been unable to <i>meet</i> our ambitious goals...</p>
<u>TO BE SUCCESSFUL IS TO BE THE FIRST IN NATURAL NUMBERS</u>	<i>The same</i>	We are also the clear <i>number one</i> in Slovakia...

Table 3: Overview of conceptual metaphors identified in the English texts

There is plenty of material to be assessed from many different points of view, but such a comprehensive analysis is not this thesis's aim. As can be seen, the CMs are very much the same in both languages, which holds true also for such specific cases like TO BE SUCCESSFUL IS TO BE THE FIRST IN NATURAL NUMBERS. This is of course due to the translations. The similarity of conceptual metaphors was assumed, although it is better observed at the level of generic metaphors.

Also, there are quite a lot of borderline cases, which might point to the not-so-small extent of subjectivity. There are also some special cases:

- TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO MOVE DOWN: This CM occurs in both languages (because of the translation) and has only one occurrence. It deviates from the general image of pursuing success as moving up/forward (as some of the CMs in the ‘movement’ group show). However, it is not because of any unsystematic nature of the concepts. Here the downward movement is desired for a negative entity, namely credit losses. So it is in fact an example of a systematic nature of concepts because it can be predicted – on the basis of this metaphor and the other ‘movement’ metaphors – that negative entities are desired to go down, whether positive entities are desirable if going up.
- TO DEAL WITH DIFFICULTIES (WHILE PURSUING SUCCESS) IS TO DEFEAT [THE DIFFICULTIES] (in English); TO DEAL WITH DIFFICULTIES (WHILE PURSUING SUCCESS) IS TO GET OVER TRAPS (ON ONE’S WAY) (in Czech); TO OVERCOME DIFFICULTIES IS TO LEAVE [THE DIFFICULTIES] BEHIND YOU (in Czech) – these are the only cases where overcoming obstacles is concerned. Also it seems that the overcoming of obstacles is related to movement in Czech, and to fight in English. However, it would have to be tested on a larger number of examples.
- TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO LIMIT ONE’S REACH (in Czech) – this is not very typical, as can be assumed from the other CMs. Typically, expanding or growing is desirable, not limiting one’s movements. From the context (GE_cs) it can be observed, however, that this is not a typical activity of a company. This could be an example of the isolated, unsystematic CM.

Specific-level metaphors belonging to a generic-level metaphor TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE INVOLVED IN INTERACTION are in both languages borderline cases. It is usually because they are highly lexicalized and their metaphoricity is very weak (e.g. *to present sth/představit nové modely, reagovat na požadavky...*) and some of the expressions occur only in specific phrases (e.g. *meet our goals*). Weak metaphoricity was often the reason for borderline cases and this weak metaphoricity was very often, (if not

always), caused by the lexicalization of the expressions (*vycházet někomu vstříc [v požadavcích]*, *pozitivní přístup*, *setkat se se silným oblasem*, etc.).

As can be seen, the majority of metaphors are connected to movement, as was also presupposed. This concept is going to be commented on in greater detail. The *Master Metaphor List* (MML; Lakoff et al. 1991) lists a generic metaphor ACTION IS MOTION. I dare to say that it is this metaphor that can be specified into the one identified in this thesis, namely TO PURSUE SUCCESS / TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO MOVE. A subcase of ACTION IS MOTION (in MML) is PROGRESS IS FORWARD MOVEMENT which is found in the analysis in a form TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO MOVE FORWARD (number 6 in English metaphors), but some of the specific-level metaphors could imply a forward movement as well (TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO WALK, TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO WALK ON WHILE MAINTAINING PACE and others).

The movement category is very broad and there are certain CMs that could form a separate category, namely:

- TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO BECOME BIGGER (Eng)
- TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS / TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO GROW (Eng)
- TO PURSUE SUCCESS / TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO GROW (UPWARDS) (Czech)
- TO PURSUE SUCCESS / TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO BECOME WIDER (Czech)

GROWTH could be classified either on its own, or along with BECOMING BIGGER, or also together with BECOMING WIDER. The reason why all these metaphors were included in the concept of MOVEMENT, is that it is a kind of movement (very generalized). Moreover, the patterns, i.e. the most frequent concepts in the source domains, can be better observed.

The metaphor TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO BECOME BIGGER IN AMOUNT is a borderline case because of its categorization into the MOVEMENT concept; the movement here is not that evident, although, I argue, it is still present. Similar case is, in my view, the metaphor TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BRING [STH BENEFICIAL] WITH YOU.

Also being borderline, the metaphor TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PHYSICALLY (BETTER) SUPPORT [STH YOU NEED FOR YOUR SUCCESS] seems at first glance as having a basic

meaning in the physical sense of *support*. Interestingly, the etymology dictionary, which was consulted to support this assumption (pun intended), revealed that the physical sense was not the only original sense. However, since *support* is originally a compound of *sub* ‘up from under’ + *portare* ‘to carry’, the physical meaning was established as the basic one.

The reason why TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE A NIMBLE SPEEDBOAT is classified as MOVEMENT is because of the mapping. What seems to be mapped is the ability of the boat to be agile and move quickly, therefore its classification.

Some of the identified metaphors seem to be coherent. For example, TO BE PHYSICALLY STRONG and TO ENGAGE IN FIGHTING form a coherent system: In order to fight (successfully), a person needs to be physically strong (preferably). This supports the coherence aspect of conceptual system as is discussed by Lakoff and Johnson (and others).

Moreover, CMT says that the target domain is usually more abstract, while the source domain tends to be more concrete. This is also supported, (although not entirely), by this analysis, since three most frequent source domains: MOVEMENT, FIGHT, and STRENGTH are physically, therefore concretely, based. The three concepts are going to be analysed a bit further. But first, the ‘assumptions’ and WIDLII category are going to be presented. Both categories are divided with respect to the two languages involved.

Generic-level metaphors	Specific-level metaphors	Examples from the texts
TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO MOVE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BRING [STH POSITIVE] ALONG 2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO REACH A DESTINATION WHICH IS UP 3. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO RUN [SOMEWHERE DESIRED] 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. V západní Evropě <i>jsme si vedli</i> mnohem lépe než... 2. Bez tohoto silného týmu bychom nikdy nemohli (...) <i>dosáhnout vysokých cílů!</i> 3. dvanáct mezinárodních <i>náběhů</i> do výroby
TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO ENGAGE IN FIGHTING	TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO REINFORCE ONE’S POSITION IN BATTLE	...jsme zde opět <i>posílili svou pozici nejsilnější</i> dovážené značky...
<u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE</u>	TO BE IN DESIRED CONDITION IS TO BE MADE	Pokračovali jsme v práci na <i>zjednodušení</i> interních

<u>UNIFIED</u>	OF ONE PART (NOT BEING DECOMPOSABLE) (2)	procesů...
TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO WEAVE (USING STRIPS/THREADS ETC.)	<i>The same</i>	V následujících letech budeme pokračovat v systematickém rozšiřování a <i>rozvoji</i> ...
TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PARTICIPATE IN A COMPETITION	TO BE SUCCESSFUL IS TO ACHIEVE GOOD RESULTS IN A COMPETITION (2)	Díky kombinaci (...) se nám v roce 2014 podařilo <i>dosáhnout skvělých finančních výsledků</i>

Table 4: 'Assumptions' in the Czech language

- *V západní Evropě jsme si vedli mnohem lépe než...* [*we were doing well*]⁴² is classified as TO BRING [STH POSITIVE] ALONG because *vést si* [*do well*] is derived from *vést* [*bring something along*] but is so lexicalized that it is basically an assumption.
- *...jsme zde opět posílili svou pozici nejsilnější dovážené značky...* [*reinforce one's position of the strongest*] – It could imply sport as well but battle seems more probable. It is purely subjective.
- *zjednodušení* [*simplification*] – the etymology of the (Czech) word is not certain, it was nowhere to be found.
- *rozvoj* [*development*] – very lexicalized and not sure if it derives from *vít* [*to weave*]
- *dosáhnout* [*reach*] on its own is analysed in the movement category as TO REACH (ONE'S HAND) AND TOUCH [THE DESIRED GOAL] but the whole phrase *dosáhnout skvělých výsledků* [*achieve great results*] as an example of the concept of COMPETITION is only an assumption.

WIDLII in the Czech texts:

1. *Díky kombinaci těchto aktivit a vysokému nasazení* [*to make effort*] *se nám v roce 2014 podařilo...*; *Díky jejich pracovnímu nasazení se nám v roce 2013 podařilo...* – seems to be derived from *sadit, sázet* [*to plant*] but the link is difficult to find.

⁴² The translations are mine, not taken from the other language versions of the analysed texts.

2. *I přesto, že jsme se v minulém roce museli vyrovnávat [deal with something] se silným vlivem...* – seems to be metaphorical.

Generic-level metaphors	Specific-level metaphors	Examples from the texts
TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PARTICIPATE IN A COMPETITION	TO BE SUCCESSFUL IS TO ACHIEVE GOOD RESULTS IN A COMPETITION	...without their trust and support our company would not have <i>achieved such successful results</i> .
TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO DO SPORT	1. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PLAY IN A LEAGUE 2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE A SUCCESSFUL SPORTS TEAM	1. That is the <i>league we play in</i> . 2. Without this <i>strong team</i> , we would have been unable to...
TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO MOVE	1. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO REACH A DESTINATION WHICH IS UP	1. ...before we <i>reach</i> new <i>heights</i> again.
TO BE SUCCESSFUL IS TO BE A (UNDISPUTED) LEADER	<i>The same</i>	We <i>remain the undisputed market leader</i> ...

Table 5: ‘Assumptions’ in the English language

- *achieve such successful results* – could be also a concept of RESEARCH, e.g., but with respect to the context of ARs and other CMs, COMPETITION seems more probable.

WIDLII in the English texts:

1. *we were able to maintain deliveries at nearly the same record level*
2. *we posted the second-best level of deliveries*
3. *...and puts us in an excellent position for 2014.*

All these examples seem metaphorical.

For even better comparison, the already generalized concepts can be generalized even further. From these concepts, then, another pattern can be observed, namely ‘static’ vs ‘dynamic’ nature of the concepts with respect to their frequency of occurrence. Table 6 shows such generalization – it does not include WIDLII cases, obviously, nor the ‘assumptions’.

As can be seen, among the most frequent concepts (not borderline), the ‘dynamic’ concepts prevail – these are MOVEMENT, FIGHT, and TO BUILD. The concept of PHYSICAL STRENGTH is not clear-cut: for instance, *to be strong* is static, *to gather strength* is quite dynamic, and *to support somebody* is somewhere in between.

Source domain – generalized	Czech texts	English texts
MOVEMENT	40	24
PHYSICAL STRENGTH	9	10
FIGHT	5	5
TO BUILD	1	1
TO SHINE	1	–
<u>TO INTERACT</u>	6	5
<u>TO BE UNIFIED,</u> <u>TO BE INTACT/COMPLETE</u>	1	1
<u>TO BE NUMBER ONE</u>	1	1
<u>TO GET LOUD ECHO</u>	1	–
<u>TO LIMIT ONE’S REACH</u>	1	–
<u>TO FILL UP A CONTAINER</u>	1	–
<u>TO BE DIVERSE</u>	–	1

Table 6: An overview of more generalized generic concepts

5.1 Movement, physical strength, and fight

Almost at the very end of the thesis, some attention should be paid to the three most frequent concepts: MOVEMENT, PHYSICAL STRENGTH, and FIGHT. The present chapter goes back to the specific-level metaphors in each language. The metaphors are only displayed for comparison; the aim was to put similar/the same metaphors next to each other. For a better overview, tables are used again.

MOVEMENT	
Czech	English
1. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS/TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO GROW (UPWARDS)</u> (8)	1. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS / TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO GROW (3) 2. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO BECOME BIGGER (3) 3. TO BE MORE SUCCESSFUL IS TO BE TALLER 4. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO GROW BEYOND ONE'S DELIMITED SPACE
2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS / TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO BECOME WIDER (4) 3. <u>TO BE IN DESIRED CONDITION IS TO BE WIDER</u>	5. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO BECOME BIGGER IN AMOUNT 6. TO BE IN DESIRED CONDITION IS TO BE WIDER
4. TO PURSUE SUCCESS/TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO REACH (ONE'S HAND) AND TOUCH [THE DESIRED GOAL] (5) 5. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO (PHYSICALLY) TOUCH [THE DESIRED GOAL] WHICH IS UPWARDS	7. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO REACH (ONE'S HAND) AND TOUCH [THE DESIRED GOAL]
6. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO WALK (5) 7. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO MOVE ON WHILE MAINTAINING PACE 8. TO OVERCOME DIFFICULTIES IS TO LEAVE [THE DIFFICULTIES] BEHIND YOU 9. TO DEAL WITH DIFFICULTIES (WHILE PURSUING SUCCESS) IS TO GET OVER TRAPS (ON ONE'S WAY) 10. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO GET BEYOND ONE'S DELIMITED SPACE (PHYSICALLY)	8. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO WALK</u> 9. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO WALK ON WHILE MAINTAINING PACE</u> 10. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO MOVE FORWARD
11. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE ON A JOURNEY 12. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO FOLLOW A PATH 13. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO REACH A DESTINATION (ON ONE'S WAY)</u> 14. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO WALK TOWARDS [CUSTOMERS] TO MEET THEM</u> 15. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE ABLE TO COME CLOSER [TO WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE]	11. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE ON A JOURNEY
16. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PHYSICALLY ENTER [DESIRED PLACES] (2)	12. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PHYSICALLY ENTER [A DESIRED PLACE]</u>
17. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO MOVE UP (3)	13. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO MOVE UP (4) 14. <u>TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO CLIMB UP</u>
18. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO MOVE DOWN	15. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO MOVE DOWN

19. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE A NIMBLE SPEEDBOAT</u>	16. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE A NIMBLE SPEEDBOAT</u>
	17. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BRING [STH BENEFICIAL] WITH YOU</u>

Table 7: A comparative overview of MOVEMENT-related metaphors

PHYSICAL STRENGTH	
Czech	English
1. TO BE (POTENTIALLY) SUCCESSFUL / TO BE IN DESIRED CONDITION IS TO BE PHYSICALLY STRONG (4)	1. TO BE (POTENTIALLY) SUCCESSFUL / TO BE IN DESIRED CONDITION IS TO BE PHYSICALLY STRONG (5)
2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BECOME PHYSICALLY STRONG(ER) (2)	2. TO BECOME SUCCESSFUL IS TO BECOME PHYSICALLY STRONG
3. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO LET SB SUPPORT YOU PHYSICALLY	3. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO LET SB SUPPORT YOU PHYSICALLY (2)
4. TO BE (POTENTIALLY) SUCCESSFUL IS TO BE A PHYSICALLY STRONG PARTNER	4. TO BE (POTENTIALLY) SUCCESSFUL IS TO BE A PHYSICALLY STRONG PARTNER
5. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PHYSICALLY SUPPORT [STH BENEFICIAL]	5. <u>TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PHYSICALLY (BETTER) SUPPORT [STH YOU NEED FOR YOUR SUCCESS]</u>

Table 8: A comparative overview of STRENGTH-related metaphors

FIGHT	
Czech	English
1. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE ABLE TO COMMAND SUCCESSFULLY IN BATTLE (3)	1. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE ABLE TO COMMAND SUCCESSFULLY IN BATTLE (2)
2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO ATTACK IN BATTLE	2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO ATTACK IN BATTLE (2)
3. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO ATTACK IN BATTLE AND WIN	
	3. TO DEALT WITH DIFFICULTIES (WHILE PURSUING SUCCESS) IS TO DEFEAT [THE DIFFICULTIES]

Table 9: A comparative overview of FIGHT-related metaphors

The concept of MOVEMENT is the most important and probably interesting one and can be classified into sub-concepts as follows (numbers in brackets indicate the number of examples of the given concept or metaphor; the sub-concepts are ordered in descending order according to the number of their members):

Czech texts:

GROWTH, EXPANSION (13):

1. TO PURSUE SUCCESS / TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO GROW (UPWARDS) (8)
2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS / TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO BECOME WIDER (4)
3. TO BE IN DESIRED CONDITION IS TO BE WIDER

MOVEMENT FORWARD, WALK (LIKELY BUT NOT NECESSARILY FORWARD) (9)

1. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO WALK (5)
2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO MOVE ON WHILE MAINTAINING PACE
3. TO OVERCOME DIFFICULTIES IS TO LEAVE [THE DIFFICULTIES] BEHIND YOU
4. TO DEAL WITH DIFFICULTIES IS TO GET OVER TRAPS (ON ONE'S WAY)
5. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO GET BEYOND ONE'S DELIMITED SPACE (PHYSICALLY)

MOVEMENT SOMEWHERE (also implied/presupposed) (7)

1. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE ON A JOURNEY
2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO FOLLOW A PATH
3. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO REACH A DESTINATION (ON ONE'S WAY)
4. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO WALK TOWARDS [CUSTOMERS] TO MEET THEM
5. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE ABLE TO COME CLOSER [TO WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE]
6. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PHYSICALLY ENTER [DESIRED PLACES] (2)

MOVEMENT OF ONE'S HAND (6)

1. TO PURSUE SUCCESS / TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO REACH (ONE'S HAND) AND TOUCH [THE DESIRED GOAL] (5)
2. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO (PHYSICALLY) TOUCH [THE DESIRED GOAL] WHICH IS UPWARDS

MOVEMENT UP (3)

TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO MOVE UP (3)

MOVEMENT DOWN (1)

TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO MOVE DOWN

TO BE A VEHICLE (1)

TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE A NIMBLE SPEEDBOAT

English

GROWTH (also in amount), EXPANSION (10):

1. TO PURSUE SUCCESS / TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO GROW (3)
2. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO BECOME BIGGER (3)
3. TO BE MORE SUCCESSFUL IS TO BE TALLER
4. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO GROW BEYOND ONE'S DELIMITED SPACE
5. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO BECOME BIGGER IN AMOUNT
6. TO BE IN DESIRED CONDITION IS TO BE WIDER

MOVEMENT UP (5)

1. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO MOVE UP (4)
2. TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO CLIMB UP

MOVEMENT FORWARD, WALK (LIKELY BUT NOT NECESSARILY FORWARD) (3)

1. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO WALK
2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO WALK ON WHILE MAINTAINING PACE
3. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO MOVE FORWARD

MOVEMENT SOMEWHERE (also implied/presupposed) (2)

1. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE ON A JOURNEY
2. TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO PHYSICALLY ENTER [A DESIRED PLACE]

MOVEMENT OF ONE'S HAND (1)

TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO REACH (ONE'S HAND) AND TOUCH [THE DESIRED GOAL]

MOVEMENT DOWN (1)

TO MAKE DESIRED PROGRESS IS TO MOVE DOWN

TO BE A VEHICLE (1)

TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BE A NIMBLE SPEEDBOAT

TO BRING SOMETHING (1)

TO PURSUE SUCCESS IS TO BRING [SOMETHING BENEFICIAL] WITH YOU

5.2 Conclusions

As has been repeatedly emphasized, such a small analysis as the one presented in the thesis cannot provide any general conclusions. However, it can provide clues for further research. And this seems to be the case. The prevailing number of MOVEMENT-related metaphors suggests something about the concept of PURSUING SUCCESS and it would be interesting to explore more about the still possibly hidden patterns. The most frequent metaphors can, truly, be the ones we live by.

What could also be another possible area of research is the underlying motivation of these metaphors, or at least the prevailing ones. The motivation, as argued by CMT, typically has some bodily basis. The physicality of the concepts of MOVEMENT, STRENGTH, and FIGHT provides a promising starting point.

The relation of a comparative analysis and metaphor to translation studies has also been mentioned. And indeed, the conceptual metaphor and the field of translation is a fruitful area of study, as numerous researches and researchers prove.⁴³ Translators should be aware that there are conceptual systems which are culture-dependent and the metaphors are something omnipresent in language, and therefore highly relevant for their work.

In a similar way, teachers and students of foreign languages should be aware of the intricate nature of conceptual systems; they should know concepts do not work universally (although some of them may), and therefore communication in a foreign language requires more than a knowledge of grammar and vocabulary. What helps

⁴³ To name just a few names: Rodríguez Márquez (2010), Piccioni (2013), Dvořák (2011), Burmakova and Marugina (2014), Schäffner (2004).

people sound idiomatic in their second language is the knowledge of concepts. Charteris-Black and Ennis (2001, 250) claim that '[t]he extent to which metaphor presents a hurdle for second language learners may depend on the extent to which there is overlap between the metaphorical systems of the L1 and the L2.'

In conclusion, the promotional aspect of annual reports provides yet another area where conceptual metaphors can be studied. The kinds of CMs a company uses to talk about itself may reveal more about its attitudes and 'self-esteem', for instance.

6. Attachments

Opening Letter of the Annual report of Škoda Auto company, Czech (ŠA_cs)

Dámy a pánové,

rok 2013 se ve společnosti ŠKODA AUTO odehrál celý ve znamení dosud největší modelové ofenzívy, jakou kdy značka podstoupila. Během jediného roku jsme veřejnosti představili osm nových či kompletně přepracovaných modelů, více než kdy předtím v naší 118leté historii. Reakce na tento krok byly velmi pozitivní. Středobodem všech těchto aktivit byla nová ŠKODA Octavia, která se setkala s velmi kladným přijetím nejen ze strany tisku a veřejnosti, ale také se silným ohlasem na jednotlivých trzích. Je zřejmé, že Octavia dostává zcela nový rozměr.

Rok 2013 potvrdil potenciál společnosti ŠKODA AUTO více, než kterýkoli rok předtím. Ať už jde o představení osmi nových či přepracovaných modelů, dvanáct mezinárodních naběhů do výroby, či rozšíření kapacit v České republice i na růstových trzích v Číně a Rusku, dynamika rozvoje společnosti je úctyhodná a ojedinělá. Nebylo by to však možné bez pozitivního přístupu a silné motivace všech zaměstnanců po celém světě. Díky jejich pracovnímu nasazení se nám v roce 2013 podařilo překonat nemalé nástrahy a výrazně pokročit ve všech oblastech naší činnosti. Proto bych chtěl spolu se svými kolegy z představenstva poděkovat všem zaměstnancům společnosti ŠKODA AUTO a jejich zástupcům v odborech za jejich pracovní nasazení a obětavost, ale také za vůli neustále překonávat vlastní limity. Bez tohoto silného týmu bychom nikdy nemohli v roce 2013 dosáhnout vysokých cílů!

Naše úspěchy v minulém roce nás pochopitelně těší, ale zároveň bychom neměli zapomínat ani na skutečnost, že uplynulý rok nebyl pro automobilové výrobce v celosvětovém měřítku vůbec lehký. V Evropě došlo ve srovnání s předchozím obdobím skoro na všech trzích k prodejnímu poklesu a trhy v Rusku a Indii také výrazně oslabily. S příchodem nového roku přirozeně nelze očekávat náhlé zlepšení situace, ale v souvislosti s klíčovými trhy se přesto začínají objevovat příznaky toho,

že to nejhorší mají již za sebou. Bude však ještě nějakou dobu trvat, než se opět projeví v plné síle.

V roce 2013 se značka ŠKODA podařilo navýšit svůj podíl skoro na všech trzích, na kterých je zastoupena, a prokázat tak opět svou sílu. V západní Evropě jsme si vedli mnohem lépe než celkově klesající trh a dodávky zákazníkům jsme zde zlepšili o 3,1 %, přičemž jsme v tomto regionu také docílili navýšení podílu na trhu na 3,2 %. Velmi silný nárůst jsme zaznamenali na našem druhém největším trhu v Německu. S nárůstem dodávek o 2,9 % jsme zde opět posílili svou pozici nejsilnější dovážené značky, a to navzdory tomu, že německý trh zaznamenal celkový pokles o 4,2 %.

Naše společnost také opět bodovala ve střední Evropě. Nadále si držíme neotřesitelné postavení vedoucí značky na domácím trhu v České republice, na kterém jsme v roce 2013 dodali zákazníkům 60 000 vozů, tedy o 0,6 % více, a to i přesto, že celkový trh oslabil o 5,3 %. Jedničkou na trhu jsme i na Slovensku s celkem 14 800 dodanými vozy, ale také v Polsku, kde jsme s 38 700 dodanými vozy značky ŠKODA meziročně navýšili dodávky zákazníkům o 6,6 %.

Naším největším samostatným trhem zůstává nadále Čína. I když se zde v roce 2013 ve srovnání s předešlým obdobím dodávky mírně snížily, uvedení nového modelu ŠKODA Octavia nás teprve čeká, což nám zaručuje ty nejlepší předpoklady k úspěchu v roce 2014.

I přesto, že jsme se v minulém roce museli vyrovnávat se silným vlivem výrobních náběhů nových modelů, podařilo se nám udržet dodávky na takřka stejné úrovni jako v rekordním roce 2012. Celkový objem dodávek zákazníkům v roce 2013 dosáhl 920 750 vozů, což je druhý nejlepší výsledek v naší historii.

Nic z toho však není dílem náhody, nýbrž výsledkem týmové práce, kterou jsme tomu věnovali v předchozích letech. Vytvořili jsme si vynikající podmínky a nabízíme správné produkty ve správné době. Naše vozy mají na trhu ideální pozici a jsou situovány na pomezí jednotlivých klasických segmentů. V nelehkém období se tak potvrzuje význam naší dlouhodobé strategie. Rozsáhlými investicemi v průběhu roku 2013 jsme si vybudovali solidní základ pro budoucí růst.

To však neznamená, že bychom usínali na vavřínech. Vývoj v posledních letech jasně dokazuje, že musíme být stále připraveni čelit dalším změnám, neboť platí, že pokud

v automobilovém průmyslu zůstane kdokoli stát na místě, začne se rovnou pohybovat pozpátku. Musíme si nadále zachovat schopnost přizpůsobovat se a rychle jednat. Nesmíme se chovat jako tanker, nýbrž jako obratný závodní člun, a musíme umět optimálně reagovat na stále rychleji se měnící požadavky trhu. Podmínky na celosvětovém automobilovém trhu nebyly nikdy v minulosti tak nestálé. Týká se to jak legislativy a dalších požadavků v jednotlivých zemích, tak i nároků našich zákazníků. Stále však platí, že rozumíme jejich potřebám a že uděláme vše pro to, abychom jim v budoucnosti mohli i nadále vycházet vstříc.

V roce 2014 se na silnicích projeví v plné síle výsledky naší modelové ofenzívy, v rámci které se dostanou do prodeje všechny nové a přepracované modely z předchozího roku. Na základě vřelého přijetí, kterého se při příležitosti svých premiér dočkaly jednotlivé modely, pevně věřím, že na naše zákazníky udělají neméně silný dojem.

Nové vozy se setkaly s velkou odezvou i u našich prodejců, kteří svými významnými investicemi do showroomů a servisního zázemí v nadcházejících letech také přispějí k trvalému celosvětovému růstu značky ŠKODA.

Kroky, ke kterým jsme přistoupili v roce 2013, nejsou pouhou jednorázovou akcí. Naše značka neustále nabírá na síle a vytváří si nezbytné výchozí podmínky pro zaručení trvalých úspěchů. Jsme na dobré cestě stát se velkým výrobcem mezinárodního významu. Toto jsou pravá měřítká, ve kterých se pohybujeme. Budeme i nadále postupovat současným tempem a v následujících letech uvedeme v průměru každých šest měsíců na trh jeden nový model.

V následujících letech budeme pokračovat v systematickém rozšiřování a rozvoji celé naší modelové palety. Nabízí se nám řada neobsazených automobilových segmentů, ve kterých by ŠKODA mohla přesvědčivě zazářit svým charakteristickým přístupem „Simply Clever“. Společnost ŠKODA AUTO se může v roce 2014 i v následujících letech těšit na velmi vzrušující budoucnost!

*Opening Letter of the Annual report of Škoda Auto company, English
(ŠA_en)*

Ladies and gentlemen,

2013 was all about ŠKODA's biggest-ever model offensive: Within just one year, we presented eight new or completely revised models to the public – more than ever before in our 118-year history. The response has been very positive. Central to it all was the new ŠKODA Octavia, which was particularly well received, not only by the press and public, but also by the markets, and looks set to take this model to the next dimension.

2013 confirmed ŠKODA's potential more than any year so far: With eight new or revised models, twelve international production ramp-ups, expansion of capacity in the Czech Republic and in the growth markets of China and Russia – the dynamic pace of development is both unique and impressive. It is sustained by the positive attitude and motivation of all our employees worldwide. Thanks to their dedication, we were able to overcome the considerable challenges of 2013 and make significant progress across the board. My Board of Management colleagues and I would therefore like to thank all ŠKODA AUTO employees and their union representatives for their hard work and dedication, and their willingness to constantly grow beyond their limits. Without this strong team, we would have been unable to meet our ambitious goals for 2013!

Despite our obvious satisfaction with our achievements last year, we should not forget that 2013 was no easy year for automobile manufacturers worldwide. In Europe, virtually all automobile markets were weaker than the previous year and markets like Russia and India also weakened significantly. Of course, the start of a new year does not automatically bring improvement, but we are already seeing signs that key markets have bottomed out. Nevertheless, it will still be a while before we reach new heights again.

ŠKODA was able to gain market share in nearly all markets in 2013 and once again confirms our Company's strength. In Western Europe, our deliveries performed significantly better than the shrinking overall market and increased by 3.1%; our market share in the region also rose to 3.2%. We saw particularly strong gains in

Germany, our second-largest market: With an increase in deliveries of 2.9% while the overall German market contracted by 4.2%, we once again expanded our position as the strongest import brand.

ŠKODA also made further gains in Central Europe. We remain the undisputed market leader in our Czech domestic market, with the delivery of 60,000 vehicles to customers in 2013 - a growth of 0.6% despite the overall market shrinking by 5.3%. We are also the clear number one in Slovakia with a total of 14,800 deliveries and in Poland, where deliveries to customers were 6.6% higher year-on-year, with 38,700 ŠKODA vehicles delivered to customers.

China remains our largest single market. Although deliveries were slightly lower here in 2013 than the previous year, the market launch of the new ŠKODA Octavia still lies ahead, and puts us in an excellent position for 2014.

In 2013, even as we were heavily impacted by the production ramp-up of the new models, we were able to maintain deliveries at nearly the same record level as in 2012. With a total of 920,750 vehicles delivered, we posted the second-best level of deliveries in our history.

None of this happened by chance. It is the result of our concerted efforts in recent years. Today, we are in an excellent situation, with the right products at the right time and vehicles ideally positioned between the classic segments. Our strategy is proving its worth in difficult times. With extensive investments in 2013, we continued to lay the foundation of our future growth.

We are by no means resting on our laurels. As we have successfully proven in recent years, our Company must always be ready for further change – because in the automotive industry, standing still means moving backwards. We must remain agile and adaptable: not a tanker, but a nimble speedboat, able to respond to faster-changing market demands in the best way possible. Conditions in the global automobile markets are changing more rapidly than ever. This applies to legislation and local requirements, as well as the demands of our customers. We understand their needs and will do everything to continue to meet them in the future.

In 2014, we will bring the full power of our model offensive to the roads, as all of the new and revised models presented in 2013 become available in all markets. And from

the overwhelming response their premieres received last year, I am confident our customers will be impressed.

The new models are also popular with our dealers, who, over the coming years, will contribute to ŠKODA's continued growth worldwide with substantial investment in showrooms and service areas.

2013 was not a unique show of effort. Our brand is increasingly gathering strength – and creating the necessary conditions for our sustained success. We are well on our way to become an international volume manufacturer. That is the league we play in. We will maintain this pace, and continue to present a new model every six months on average over the coming years.

Over the coming years, we will continue to systematically expand and supplement our product range. There are still many segments in the automotive markets, where ŠKODA could perform exceptionally well with its signature “Simply Clever” features. Things are sure to remain exciting at ŠKODA in 2014 and in the years ahead!

*Opening Letter of the Annual report of GE Money Bank company,
Czech (GE_cs)*

Vážení akcionáři, klienti, obchodní partneři a kolegové,

díky našim klientům, zaměstnancům a obchodním partnerům patřil rok 2014 mezi ty úspěšné. Strategie z roku 2013, kdy jsme se rozhodli rozšířit naše obchodní aktivity, se ukázala být úspěšná:

- Rozšířili jsme naši finanční skupinu GE Money (dále jen „skupina GEM“ nebo „skupina“) o společnost VB Leasing CZ, spol. s r.o., která se nyní jmenuje GE Money Leasing, s.r.o. S tím přichází i širší nabídka produktů pro naše stávající i nové klienty.
- V komerčním bankovníctví jsme úspěšně vstoupili do nových odvětví s vysokým potenciálem růstu. Vstup banky do odvětví financování komerčních nemovitostí byl dalším strategickým milníkem pro naši obchodní činnost.

- Pokračujeme v podpoře inovací, které uspokojují potřeby našich klientů. Na našich pobočkách jsme uvedli do provozu zařízení, které umožňuje vytvořit biometrické podpisové vzory. Jde o inovativní řešení, které má mnoho výhod včetně prevence podvodů a ochrany životního prostředí.
- Pokračovali jsme v práci na zjednodušování interních procesů, abychom zefektivnili naše podnikání.

Díky kombinaci těchto aktivit a vysokému nasazení se nám v roce 2014 podařilo dosáhnout skvělých finančních výsledků:

- Konsolidovaný čistý zisk vzrostl o 11 % a dosáhl 4,3 miliardy Kč.
- Celková aktiva vzrostla o 7 % a dosáhla výše 144,1 miliardy Kč.
- Vklady klientů činí 96,9 miliardy Kč, vrostly o 3,3 miliardy v porovnání s předchozím rokem.
- Úvěrové ztráty činily 1,4 miliardy Kč, poklesly o 53 % v porovnání s předchozím rokem.
- Provozní náklady (tj. správní náklady a odpisy majetku) činily 5,1 miliardy Kč, poměr provozních nákladů k čistým výnosům (Cost/Income Ratio) tak tvořil 42,5 %.
- Kapitálová přiměřenost vzrostla na 27,8 % a je téměř na dvojnásobku regulatorního požadavku (14 %).

Abychom dosáhli těchto výsledků, neustále klademe velký důraz na integritu a odpovědné podnikání. GE „Spirit & Letter“ a závazek integrity, čili silné morální zásady, které jsou stejné napříč všemi společnostmi ve skupině General Electric, se promítají do všeho, co děláme. To nám pomáhá plnit regulatorní a legislativní požadavky, zodpovědně úvěrovat a být silným partnerem všem našim klientům i celé české společnosti.

Korporace General Electric (GE) oznámila 10. dubna 2015 svůj záměr vytvořit jednodušší a efektivnější společnost a tedy výrazně omezit rozsah aktivit své divize GE Capital. V rámci toho má korporace GE v úmyslu v následujících 24 měsících prodat většinu společností GE Capital, mezi které patří i skupina GEM v České republice.

Skupina GEM je silnou českou bankou s místní regulací, s dobrou likviditou, silnou kapitálovou přiměřeností a stabilní ziskovostí. Věříme, že naše banka bude i po prodeji nadále silnou společností, jen vlastněnou jinými akcionáři.

Na závěr bych chtěl poděkovat všem zaměstnancům, klientům, obchodním partnerům a akcionářům za jejich podporu v uplynulém roce. Bez Vaší důvěry, tvrdé práce a loajality by naše společnost nedosahovala takových úspěchů.

Těším se na další spolupráci v roce 2015.

*Opening Letter of the Annual report of GE Money Bank company,
English (GE_en)*

Dear shareholders, clients, business partners and colleagues,

Thanks to our clients, our employees and our business partners, 2014 was another successful year. A year where we started to see the benefits of the strategy we put in place back in 2013 to diversify our business focus:

- We acquired VB Leasing (now called GE Money Leasing) as a way to broaden our product range, bring new commercial clients to our business and better support our existing clients' needs.
- We have successfully entered new commercial banking sectors with high growth potential, including commercial real estate.
- We continue to use innovative technology to help us improve our business, like introducing biometric client signatures which simplifies communication with clients, reduces fraud and contributes to protecting the environment.
- We have continued to place great emphasis on simplifying our processes and making our business more efficient.

Through a combination of these actions and strong execution, we delivered what we believe are strong financial results in 2014:

- CZK 4.3 billion of Consolidated Net Income, up 11% over 2013
- CZK 144.1 billion in Total Assets, up over 7%

- CZK 96.9 billion in Clients deposits, up CZK 3.3 billion
- CZK 1.4 billion Credit Losses, down 53% versus the prior year
- CZK 5.1 billion Operating Costs (administrative expenses + depreciation), representing a 42.5% cost /income ratio
- 27.8% Group Capital Adequacy nearly double the regulatory requirement (14%)

To support these operating results we have also looked to maintain our core focus on delivering with integrity and responsibility. The GE “Spirit & Letter” and integrity obligations, provide us with a set of strong moral principles which are the same across all companies in the General Electric group. These help us maintain good regulatory and legislative controls, adhere to strict responsible lending criteria and help us focus on being a strong and responsible partner for all our clients and Czech society as a whole.

After year end, GE announced on the 10th April 2015 that it will create a simpler, more valuable company by reducing the size of GE Capital through the sale of most of GE Capital’s assets. As part of this it is GE’s intention to sell the GE Money Group as a going concern within the next 24 months. GE Money Group is a strong, locally regulated, bank in the Czech market, with good liquidity, a strong capital adequacy ratio and stable profitability. Consequently, we are confident that the bank will remain a strong business after the sale, simply owned by different shareholders.

Finally, I would like to end where I started by thanking our employees, clients, business partners and shareholder for their support in the past year, without their trust and support our company would not have achieved such successful results.

We look forward to continuing to work with you in 2015.

7. Summary

Tato diplomová práce měla za úkol zmapovat koncept DOSAHOVÁNÍ ÚSPĚCHU, jak je vyjádřen konceptuálními metaforami v úvodních slovech výročních zpráv. Analýza prováděná za účelem zjištění těchto metafor byla malého rozsahu, deskriptivní a kvalitativní. Texty k analýze byly pouze čtyři: dvě česká a dvě anglická úvodní slova, vzata z výročních zpráv společností Škoda Auto a GE Money Bank. Dva z textů jsou výchozí texty a dva překlady, ale protože nebylo možné určit, které to jsou, nebylo možné provést analýzu z hlediska translatického, nýbrž pouze jako komparativní analýzu.

Vzhledem k malému množství analyzovaného materiálu si tato práce nekladla za cíl (což by ani nebylo možné) zjistit veškeré konceptuální metafory, které mohou daný koncept úspěchu vyjadřovat. Stejně tak výstupy z analýzy nemohly být zobecněny do nějakých obecně platných pravidel. Nicméně, převaha některých metafor, či spíše oblastí ve zdrojových doménách těchto metafor, naznačovala jisté tendence. Nejdříve by ale bylo vhodné zmínit něco o teorii, než zde budou prezentovány výsledky.

Metafora v této práci byla pojata jako *konceptuální*, jak již bylo řečeno, a vycházela z teorie konceptuální metafory (v angličtině Conceptual Metaphor Theory, zkráceně CMT), za jejíž průkopníky jsou považováni autoři George Lakoff a Mark Johnson, kteří o CMT napsali známou knihu *Metaphors We Live By* (1. vydání 1980), v českém překladu kniha vyšla jako *Metafory, kterými žijeme*. Tato teorie je zakotvena v kognitivním pojetí jazyka a není teorií čistě jazykovou. Dnes tento výzkum spadá do oblasti kognitivní lingvistiky, ale má přesahy i do jiných oborů, např. neurolingvistiky, psychologie aj. Základním předpokladem je, že metafora není jen nějaká básnická figura, v lepším případě neotřelé vyjádření jedné skutečnosti za pomoci skutečnosti jiné, ale je to princip, na kterém funguje celý náš konceptuální systém. To znamená, že to, jak vidíme svět, jak o něm uvažujeme a rozdělujeme jej na jednotlivé koncepty (koncepty jsou jakési kognitivní jednotky, do kterých je roztríděno naše vědění), je založeno z velké části na principu metafory. Často chápeme celé koncepty pomocí konceptů jiných (metaforický princip) a toto chápání se pak projevuje i v jazyce, konkrétně v jazykových prostředcích, které používáme. Jsou to tedy potom tyto jazykové prostředky, skrze které můžeme zkoumat náš konceptuální systém a poodhalovat jeho skrytá zákoutí.

Metafory v pojetí CMT mají tvar CÍLOVÁ DOMÉNA JE ZDROJOVÁ DOMÉNA a bývají zapisovány kapitálkami. Cílová doména (neboli koncept) je skutečnost, o které mluvíme (a o které tedy uvažujeme) částečně jako o doméně zdrojové. Příklad uváděný zmíněnými autory Lakoffem a Johnsonem je (přeloženo do češtiny) ARGUMENTACE/SPOR JE VÁLKA. O argumentech/sporech tedy podle této metafory uvažujeme jako o válce, *částečně*⁴⁴ spory podle toho strukturujeme a chováme se tak v nich a v jazyce se to projevuje výskytem slov z oblasti vedení války, když mluvíme o sporech/argumentaci. Takže můžeme říct, že jsem diskutovali s *oponentem*, snažili se debatu *vybrát* a jeho *porazit*, *ustupovali jsme*, *měli jsme v hádce navrch* apod.

Zmínění autoři sice prezentují svou teorii na angličtině a mluví i o kulturní podmíněnosti našich konceptuálních systémů, nicméně jejich teorie jako taková je aplikovatelná na (zřejmě) jakýkoli jazyk. Jejich metafory, jako třeba výše zmíněný příklad, už potom univerzální nejsou a platí pouze pro určitou kulturu, zejména definovanou jazykem. Protože však česká a anglosaská kultura nejsou tak diametrálně odlišné, dalo by se předpokládat, že určitá část metafor bude oběma kulturám společná, či alespoň budou dost podobné. Jak velká část to je, však není známo.

Z tohoto předpokladu – že tedy naše a anglosaská kultura nejsou zásadně odlišné – vycházela i tato práce, protože předpokládala, že rozdíly ve zjištěných konceptuálních metaforách nebudou velice rozdílné. Je také jasné, že translátologické povaha textů v tom bude hrát nezanedbatelnou roli. Na druhou stranu, pokud předpokládáme (což také byl případ této práce), že překlady byly kvalitní, mohla by naopak takováto srovnávací analýza poskytnout přesnější podklady z menšího množství textů. Každopádně je ale potřeba zjištěné výsledky z takto malé analýzy podrobit podrobnějšímu zkoumání založenému na velkém objemu jazykového materiálu, aby bylo možno říct o konceptuálních metaforách v češtině a angličtině něco obecněji platného.

Zkoumané metafory v této práci měly předem stanovenou cílovou doménu, tedy tu, o které nějak metaforicky uvažujeme a mluvíme. Tato doména byla nastavena jako DOSAHOVÁNÍ ÚSPĚCHU, a to proto, protože úvodní slova výročních zpráv koncept

⁴⁴ Chápání jedné domény pomocí druhé nemůže být úplné, protože potom by byly domény totožné. Vždy je ze zdrojové domény na cílovou přenesena jen část vlastností, které u cílové domény takto metaforicky chápeme.

úspěchu často vyjadřují. Je to dáno jejich komunikativním záměrem, který kromě konstatování některých faktů o dané společnosti má také za úkol působit na čtenáře pozitivním dojmem a představit společnost v co nejlepším světle. Z toho důvodu se dá předpokládat, že se autoři budou „chlubit“ dosaženými úspěchy.

Aby bylo možné zjistit metafory, kterými autoři úvodních slov vyjadřují dosahování úspěchu, bylo potřeba podívat se na text a jeho výrazy. Metoda, jak poznat, zda jsou výrazy použity metaforicky (protože konceptuální metafory nejsou často na první pohled viditelné, protože jsou pro nás samozřejmé), byla převzata od tzv. Pragglejaz group, která takovou metodu v roce 2007 vyvinula (např. in Steen et al. 2010) – nazvali ji jednoduše *Metaphor Identification Procedure* (Metoda na identifikaci metafor), zkráceně MIP. O něco později ji někteří z jejích původních autorů ještě zpřesnili a rozpracovali do metody MIPVU. Některá tato zpřesnění byla přijata i v této práci, například způsob, jak poznat metaforu, která je vyjádřena doslovným jazykem, což je například případ přirovnání nebo alegorií. Původní MIP identifikovala pouze slova použitá nepřímou.

Zjednodušený popis této metody by byl následující:

1. Pročíst text, abychom mu porozuměli.
2. Rozčlenit ho na lexikální jednotky (zde se analýza v této práci zaměřovala pouze na jednotky, které byly spjaty s konceptem dosahování úspěchu)
3. U každé této jednotky určit její význam v kontextu a poté její základní význam. Při určování obou významů hrají důležitou úlohu slovníky, které také autoři metody konkrétně doporučují⁴⁵. Základní význam (*basic meaning*) je zpravidla konkrétnější, je možné si ho snáze představit, často je spjat s tělesným pohybem, bývá přesněji definovaný a zpravidla je historicky starší. Pokud lze tento základní význam nalézt, je potřeba ho porovnat s tím kontextuálním.
4. Pokud jsou oba významy jiné, ale kontextuální význam je možné při porovnání se základním významem pochopit (dochází ke kontrastu), je jednotka metaforická.

⁴⁵ Jsou to *The Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* a *The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. Bohužel slovníky v češtině, které v této práci byly použity, nejsou stejného typu jako ty anglické, jak doporučuje např. Rodríguez Márquez (2010).

Tato metoda tedy určuje pouze metaforičnost/nemetaforičnost jednotek, nevyvozuje z nich konkrétní metafory. Bylo potřeba tedy přidat jeden krok navíc. Autoři MIP i MIPVU ale tvrdí, že metafory neurčují, protože to je vcelku složité a je to často předmětem dohadů výzkumníků.

Nicméně nic nebrání v tom se o to pokusit. Například Rodríguez Márquez (2010) tento krok také přidala, protože porovnávala konceptuální metafory a jejich překlady v americké angličtině a mexické španělštině. Důležité je u určování metafor správně určit domény, v této práci tedy zdrojovou. Snaha byla, aby tato doména byla co nejpresnější, takže by vznikly tzv. *specific-level metaphors*, jak o nich mluví Kövecses (2010a). Kövecses rozlišuje konceptuální metafory na různých úrovních podle jejich konkretizace. Takže například ACTION IS MOTION⁴⁶ [AKTIVITA JE POHYB]⁴⁷ je velice obecné a může zahrnovat více specifitějších metafor, jako např. PROGRESS IS FORWARD MOVEMENT [POSTUP JE POHYB VPŘED] a další.

Také v této práci se předpokládalo, že zjištěné metafory budou (alespoň zčásti) spjaty s nějakým druhem pohybu. Výsledky analýzy, tedy „specifické“ metafory, či spíše jejich zdrojové domény, byly zobecněny a rozděleny do skupin. Bylo zjištěno, že pohyb je opravdu nejčastější (zobecněnou) doménou (DOSAHOVÁNÍ ÚSPĚCHU JE POHYB), konkrétně ze 135 zjištěných metafor (neobsahuje sporné případy, kterých bylo pár) v obou jazycích připadalo na nějakou formu pohybu 64 metafor. Je jisté, že toto číslo musí být bráno s určitým odstupem, protože nemalá část případů byla sporná (zda zařadit do konceptu, či ne) a analýza samozřejmě podléhá subjektivnímu hodnocení (ačkoli je použita objektivní metoda).

Dalším častým konceptem (ale podstatně méně než u pohybu) byla fyzická síla (BÝT ÚSPĚŠNÝ JE BÝT FYZICKY SILNÝ) a o něco méně než síla byl zastoupen boj (DOSAHOVAT ÚSPĚCHU JE ÚČASTNIT SE BOJE). Zbylé případy byly spíše marginální a ojedinělé. V rámci těchto obecných metafor byla samozřejmě celá řada specifických metafor, kterých nebylo málo. Dá se tedy téměř s jistotou říci, že dosahování úspěchu je z velké části spjato s pohybem, ale jak moc, či zda existují metafory, které

⁴⁶ příklad převzat z tzv. *Master Metaphor List* (Lakoff et al. 1991), což je vlastně seznam konceptuálních metafor nalezených v angličtině (jen některých samozřejmě).

⁴⁷ Vlastní překlady.

nebyly tímto výzkumem odhaleny vůbec, by muselo být předmětem mnohem většího výzkumu na velkém množství jazykového materiálu.

8. Bibliography

Analysed Texts

GE Money Bank, a.s. (GE_en). 2015. *Consolidated annual report 2014*. Accessed March 9, 2016. <https://www.gemoney.cz/documents/cz/press/gemb-annual-report-2014.pdf>.

GE Money Bank, a.s. (GE_cs). 2015. *Konsolidovaná výroční zpráva 2014*. Accessed March 9, 2016. https://www.gemoney.cz/documents/cz/press/vz_2014.pdf.

Škoda Auto a.s. (ŠA_en). 2014. *Annual Report 2013*. Mladá Boleslav: Škoda Auto a.s. Accessed March 9, 2016. <http://www.skoda-auto.com/SiteCollectionDocuments/company/investors/annual-reports/en/skoda-annual-report-2013.pdf>.

Škoda Auto a.s. (ŠA_cs). 2014. *Výroční zpráva 2013*. Mladá Boleslav: Škoda Auto a.s. Accessed March 9, 2016. <http://www.skoda-auto.com/SiteCollectionDocuments/company/investors/annual-reports/cs/skoda-annual-report-2013.pdf>.

Specialist Literature (excluding online sources)

Bhatia, Vijay K. 2008. "Towards critical genre analysis." In *Advances in Discourse Studies*, edited by Vijay K. Bhatia, John Flowerdew, and Rodnes H. Jones, 166-177. London and New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

Cameron, Lynne, and Graham Low, eds. 1999. *Researching and Applying Metaphor*. Cambridge University Press.

Čejka, Mirek. 2002. Translator's note to *Metaforý, kterými žijeme*, by George Lakoff, and Mark Johnson, 269. Brno: Host.

de Groot, Elizabeth. 2014. "Corporate communication and the role of annual reporting: Identifying areas for further research." In *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Professional Communication*, edited by Vijay K. Bhatia, and Stephen Bremner, 237-253. London and New York: Routledge.

Hawkes, Terence. 2004. "Jakobson." In *Structuralism and Semiotics*, 59-69. London and New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

- Hiraga, Masako K. 1991. "Metaphor and Comparative Cultures." In *Cross-cultural communication: East and West*, vol. 3, 149-166. Tainan, Taiwan.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1995a. "Dva aspekty jazyka a dva typy afatických poruch." In *Poetická funkce*. Translated by Miroslav Červenka, 55-74. Jinočany: H&H.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1995b. "Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances." In *On Language*, 2nd ed., edited by Linda R. Waugh, and Monique Monville-Burston, 115-133. Harvard University Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2008. "Conceptual Metaphor Theory: some criticisms and alternative proposals." In *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics 6*, 168-184. John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi: 10.1075/arcl.6.08kov.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2010a. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Krennmayr, Tina. 2008. "Using Dictionaries in Linguistic Metaphor Identification." In *Selected Papers from the 2006 and 2007 Stockholm Metaphor Festivals*, edited by Nils-Lennart Johannesson and David C. Minugh, 95-110. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire And Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About The Mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 2002. *Metaforý, kterými žijeme*. Translated by Mirek Čejka. Brno: Host.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 2003. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press. eBook.
- Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall International.
- Schmid, Hans-Jörg, and Friedrich Ungerer. 2011. "Cognitive Linguistics." In *The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, edited by James Simpson, chapter 43 (separately in pdf). London and New York: Routledge.
- Steen, Gerard. 2009. "From linguistic form to conceptual structure in five steps: analysing metaphor in poetry." In *Cognitive Poetics: Goals, Gains and Gaps*, edited by

Geert Brône, Jeroen Vandaele, 197-226. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Steen, Gerard, Aletta G. Dorst, J. Berenike Herrmann, Anna A. Kaal, Tina Krennmayr, and Trijntje Pasma. 2010. *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification: From MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Vaňková, Irena, Iva Nebeská, Lucie Saicová Římalová, and Jasňa Šlédrová. 2005. *Co Na Srdci, To Na Jazyku: Kapitoly Z Kognitivní Lingvistiky*. 1st ed. Praha: Karolinum.

Wikberg, Kay. 2008. "The Role of Corpus Studies in Metaphor Research." In *Selected Papers from the 2006 and 2007 Stockholm Metaphor Festivals*, edited by Nils-Lennart Johannesson, and David C. Minugh, 29-42. Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Online Sources (excluding dictionaries and databases)

Bhatia, Vijay K. 2002. "Applied genre analysis: a multi-perspective model." *Iberica* 4:3-19. *Directory of Open Access Journals*, EBSCOhost. Accessed April 6, 2016. <http://www.aelfe.org/documents/text4-Bhatia.pdf>.

Burmakova, Elena A., and Nadezda I. Marugina. 2014. "Cognitive Approach to Metaphor Translation in Literary Discourse." *Procedia – Social And Behavioral Sciences* 154, no. THE XXV ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL ACADEMIC CONFERENCE, LANGUAGE AND CULTURE, 20-22 October 2014:527-533. *ScienceDirect*, EBSCOhost. Accessed March 17, 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.10.180.

Cameron, Lynne, and Alice Deignan. 2003. "Combining Large and Small Corpora to Investigate Tuning Devices Around Metaphor in Spoken Discourse." *Metaphor & Symbol* 18, no. 3:149-160. *Academic Search Complete*, EBSCOhost. Accessed March 17, 2016. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=10371510&site=eds-live&authtype=uid>.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan, and Timothy Ennis. 2001. "A comparative study of metaphor in Spanish and English financial reporting." *English For Specific Purposes* 20:249-266. *ScienceDirect*, EBSCOhost. Accessed March 21, 2016. doi:10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00009-0.

- Ding, Ersu. 2007. "The handles and sides of metaphor." *Semiotica* 2007, no. 167:119-134. *Publisher Provided Full Text Searching File, EBSCOhost*. Accessed April 6, 2016. doi: 10.1515/SEM.2007.073.
- Dvořák, Petr. 2011. "Translating Metaphors within Political Discourse: The Case of EU." Master's Diploma Thesis, Masaryk University. Accessed March 24, 2016. <http://theses.cz/id/s7fd93/>.
- Hapková, Klára. 2013. "Využití konceptuálních metafor v českém reklamním diskurzu." Master's Diploma Thesis, University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice. Accessed April 6, 2016. <http://theses.cz/id/fnjakd/>.
- Hyland, Ken. 1998. "Exploring Corporate Rhetoric: Metadiscourse in the CEO's Letter." *Journal Of Business Communication* 35, no. 2:224-245. *Business Source Complete, EBSCOhost*. Accessed April 6, 2016. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=1310707&site=eds-live&authtype=uid>.
- Hynes, Geraldine E. 2004. "Annual Reports: A Tool for Businesses, Investors, and Educators." *Education Review of Business Communication* 1(1):81-96. Accessed April 6, 2016. https://www.google.cz/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0ahUKEwifroWupfrLAhWnQpoKHYn8A0oQFggcMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ibrarian.net%2Fnavon%2Fpaper%2FAnnual_Reports__A_Tool_for_Businesses__Investors_.pdf%3Fpaperid%3D3984046&usg=AFQjCNHjonnfrNj1vGuDXU1Mfb7GJcT8A.
- Kirby, John T. 1997. "Aristotle on Metaphor." *The American Journal of Philology*, vol. 118, no. 4:517-554. *JSTOR Journals, EBSCOhost*. Accessed April 12, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1562051>.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2010b. "Metaphor and Culture." *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica* 2, no. 2:197-220. Accessed April 6, 2016. <http://www.acta.sapientia.ro/acta-philo/C2-2/phil022-1.pdf>.
- Lakoff, George, Jane Espenson, and Alan Schwartz. 1991. *The Master Metaphor List*, second draft copy. University of California at Berkeley. Accessed April 22, 2016. <http://araw.mede.uic.edu/~alansz/metaphor/METAPHORLIST.pdf>.

- Piccioni, Sara. 2013. "What can Metaphor Tell us about the Language of Translation?." *Procedia – Social And Behavioral Sciences* 95, no. Corpus Resources for Descriptive and Applied Studies. Current Challenges and Future Directions: Selected Papers from the 5th International Conference on Corpus Linguistics (CILC2013): 354-362. *ScienceDirect*, EBSCOhost. Accessed April 6, 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.657.
- Rashed, Nareeman Jabbar. 2012. "Means of Arguments in Bank's Annual Reports." *Journal of the College of Education for Women* 23(1):160-174. Accessed April 6, 2016. <http://www.iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=30064>.
- Rodríguez Márquez, María de Montserrat. 2010. "Patterns of translation of metaphor in annual reports in American English and Mexican Spanish." *British Library ETbOS*, EBSCOhost. Accessed March 9, 2016. <http://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.531391>.
- Royo López, Ana María, and María Ángeles Orts Llopis. 2010. "Metaphorical pattern analysis in financial texts: Framing the crisis in positive or negative metaphorical terms." *Journal Of Pragmatics* 42:3300-3313. *ScienceDirect*, EBSCOhost. Accessed April 6, 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.06.001.
- Rutherford, Brian. 2005. "Genre Analysis of Corporate Annual Report Narratives." *Journal Of Business Communication* 42, no. 4:349-378. Business Source Complete, EBSCOhost. Accessed March 9, 2016. doi: 10.1177/0021943605279244.
- Schäffner, Christina. 2004. "Metaphor and translation: some implications of a cognitive approach." *Journal Of Pragmatics* 36, no. Metaphor:1253-1269. *ScienceDirect*, EBSCOhost. Accessed April 6, 2016. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2003.10.012.
- Steen, Gerard. 2002a. "Identifying Metaphor in Language: A Cognitive Approach." *Style* 36, no. 3:386-407. *JSTOR Journals*, EBSCOhost. Accessed April 6, 2016. doi: 10.5325/style.36.3.386.
- Steen, Gerard. 2002b. "Towards a procedure for metaphor identification." *Language & Literature* 11, no. 1:17-33. *Publisher Provided Full Text Searching File*, EBSCOhost. Accessed April 6, 2016. doi: 10.1177/096394700201100103.

Zanola, Annalisa. 2010. "The Annual Report: An Interdisciplinary Approach to a 'Contaminated' New Genre." Paper presented at the international conference *Genre on the Move. Hybridization and Discourse Change in Specialized Communication*, Università Federico II, Naples, December 9, 2009. Accessed April 6, 2016. <http://www.unibs.it/sites/default/files/ricerca/allegati/Paper109.pdf>.

Dictionaries and Databases

ABZ slovník cizích slov. 2016. Accessed March 13. <http://slovník-cizich-slov.abz.cz/>.

The Chicago Manual of Style Online. 2016. "Chicago-Style Citation Quick Guide." Accessed April 7. http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide.html.

Davies, Mark. 2008-. *The Corpus of Contemporary American English: 520 million words, 1990-present*. <http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>.

Holub, Josef, and Stanislav Lyr. 1978. *Stručný Etymologický Slovník Jazyka Českého Se Zvláštním Zřetelem K Slovům Kulturním A Cizím*. 2nd ed. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

Klein, Ernest. 1971. *A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary Of The English Language: Dealing With The Origin Of Words And Their Sense Development Thus Illustrating The History Of Civilization And Culture*. Unabridged, one-volume ed. Amsterdam: Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company.

Kopečný, František, and Josef Holub. 1952. *Etymologický Slovník Jazyka Českého*. 3. rev. ed. Praha: Státní nakladatelství učebnic.

Křen, M., V. Cvrček, T. Čapka, A. Čermáková, M. Hnátková, L. Chlumská, T. Jelínek, D. Kovářiková, V. Petkevič, P. Procházka, H. Skoumalová, M. Škrabal, P. Truneček, P. Vondříčka, and A. Zasina. 2015. *SYN2015: reprezentativní korpus psané češtiny*. Praha: Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK. <http://www.korpus.cz>.

Macmillan Dictionary. ©2009-2016. Accessed March 31st, 2016. Macmillan Publishers Limited. <http://www.macmillandictionary.com>.

Mejstřík, Vladimír et al. 2010. *Slovník spisovné češtiny pro školu a veřejnost. S dodatkem Ministerstva školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy České republiky*, 4th ed. Praha: Academia.

- Online Etymology Dictionary. 2016. Accessed March 9. <http://etymonline.com/>.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (OALD). 2010. CD-ROM. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: <http://oald8.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/>.
- Oxford Dictionaries. 2016. Accessed March 9. <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/>.
- Ptejte se knihovny. 2016. Accessed March 21.
<http://www.ptejteseknihovny.cz/dotazy/milnik-vyznam-a-etymologie>.
- Rejzek, Jiří. 2001. *Český Etymologický Slovník*. 1st ed. Voznice: Leda.
- Ústav pro jazyk český Akademie věd České republiky. 2016. "Internetová jazyková příručka." Praha: Ústav pro jazyk český Akademie věd ČR, v. v. i. Accessed April 14. <http://prirucka.ujc.cas.cz/>.

9. Annotation

This thesis is a comparative study of Czech and English opening letters of annual reports with a focus on conceptual metaphors. The main aim is to identify and infer concrete conceptual metaphors with a pre-established target domain of PURSUING SUCCESS, and subsequently compare the conceptual metaphors within the two languages with respect to similarities and differences. Additionally, there is a focus on frequent concepts in the inferred metaphors. The thesis deals with relevant aspects of cognitive metaphor theory, metaphor identification procedure that is used in the analysis, the genre of opening letters, and finally presents the results of the analysis.

Key words: conceptual metaphor, conceptual metaphor theory, opening letter of annual report, success, metaphor identification procedure

Anotace

Tato diplomová práce má formu komparativní analýzy českých a anglických úvodních slov ve výročních zprávách a zaměřuje se na konceptuální metafory. Hlavním záměrem je identifikovat a vyvodit konkrétní konceptuální metafory, které mají předem určenou cílovou doménu, a to DOSAHOVAT ÚSPĚCHU. Poté jsou zjištěné metafory v rámci oněch dvou jazyků porovnány, a to vzhledem k jejich podobnostem a odlišnostem. Snahou je také zjistit, zda některé koncepty zjištěných metafor nepřevažují nad jinými. Tato práce se zabývá relevantními aspekty kognitivní teorie metafory, postupu pro identifikaci metafory, žánru úvodních slov a nakonec prezentuje výsledky provedené analýzy.

Klíčová slova: konceptuální metafora, teorie konceptuální metafory, úvodní slovo výroční zprávy, úspěch, postup na identifikaci metafory