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Business English has exceeded its original purpose; more and more people around the world have come across some parts of its terminology and expressions. It is no longer the language of companies and managers, it is also the ordinary speakers or learners of English who not only use the expressions from time to time but, mainly, they are able to understand some expressions. Similarly, metaphors were originally meant to be used in poetry but soon after that people started to use and include metaphors in their normal speeches. And as the time went by, metaphors became a part of fields using special vocabulary and jargon, such as medicine or business. Therefore, metaphors used in Business English will be dealt with in this thesis. There is, however, a huge number of metaphors in this field. Since business involves strategy, planning, losing and winning as warfare and fighting does, hence, it will be the metaphors of war only used in the analysis of the thesis. First, a brief history of metaphors will be presented, second, books and other resources will be introduced, third, the main body of the thesis and research will be offered to consideration, fourth, there will be a conclusion of the thesis answering all the issues arising from the research. And last, a list of metaphors of war used in the research will be added.
1.1 History

Since metaphor was primarily used as a figure of speech in poetry, it was invented in the cradle of poetry, the ancient Greece. According to Hawkes (1972) the word metaphor:

comes from the Greek word *metaphora* derived from *meta* meaning 'over' and *pherein*, 'to carry'. It refers to a particular set of linguistic processes whereby aspects of one object are 'carried over' of transferred to another object, so that the second object is spoken of as if were the first. There are various types of metaphor, and the number of 'objects' to vary, but the general procedure of 'transference' remains the same. Metaphor is traditionally taken to be the most fundamental form of figurative language. (p. 1)

In addition, the first theoretical analyses were carried out by Greek scholars, such as Aristotle. In his well-known books *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* he paid attention to the subject of metaphor in great detail. In *Rhetoric* (n.d.) he said that metaphor was "the application to one thing of a name belonging to another thing. The analysis is carried out in terms of content, not form."

During the Middle Ages, it was not only poets who carried on using various metaphors but also other writers and playwrights. Shakespeare, among others, the most famous.

Leaving aside the permanent practical usage of metaphors, theoretical works started to emerge in the middle of the twentieth century. As Cohen (1978) summed up the history of the discourse of metaphor, "Occasional remarks about metaphor are to be found in Aristotle, Hobbes, Locke, Nietzsche, among others, but the topic seems to have begun to receive continuous attention, especially from analytical philosophers, some time after 1950" (p. 1).

As far as the metaphors of war are concerned, Goatly (2006) offered explanation why human life and warfare were so much connected. "Hobbes is probably most famous for his claim that in its natural state society is at war" (p. 34). Later he also said that "a common power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called war" (p. 34). It can be assumed that business is an artificial war invented by men who are fight-thirsty in their origin.
2. Metaphors Analysed

The research which will be undertaken in the following chapter is based on one hundred metaphors of war used in Business English. Naturally, these metaphors can be more or less frequently used in other fields of human activity since there is no strict categorization. However, all the metaphors selected for the thesis research have been taken from various theory books, dictionaries, such as *Oxford English Advanced Dictionary*, corpora, textbooks of Business English and scholar articles. Almost all the resources addressed within the thesis and research offered at least several examples to the selected hundred one. Most examples can be found in publications by Brown, Kenny and Sunderland, Raffaelli and Wood.

As has been said above, the metaphors are basically of two origins; those that belong into the category BUSINESS IS WAR, and those that are categorized as ARGUMENT IS WAR since both war and business usually consists of two parts – making plans (talking, discussing, argumenting) and fulfilling them.

When conducting the research and making conclusion out of it, the hundred metaphors chosen will be considered to be the general, ordinary examples of metaphors of war since they have been chosen at random.

Also, the majority of the works cited within the research was published in either Great Britain or the United States and, thus, the aimed readership is other scholars as well as people round the world learning Business English. Therefore, all the metaphors in the books are alive, e.i. metaphors which are communicated in business surrounding on a daily basis.
3. Thesis and Research

This chapter explores the theory of metaphors in general since there is no special theory as far as metaphors of war or business metaphors are concerned. However, all general theories will be examined from the perspective of the selected metaphors.

The questions this research is going to answer towards the end of the thesis are following:

1. What is the nature of military metaphors?
2. What is the structure of these metaphors?
3. Are metaphors of war cross-cultural?

To extend the questions, the first issue raised will present an overview of the metaphors of war as far as their nature is concerned. Since both war and business are likely to have only two possible endings – victory or defeat – business metaphors of war are supposed to be either defensive or offensive. The first question will, therefore, answer the question which type prevails. The second question will deal with the structure of the metaphors, the primary and secondary vocabulary used to make them, focus and frame, and will try to state generalizations about them. The third issue is connected to the spread of these metaphor as far as culture and social issues are concerned. In connection to this question, the matter of experience will be also discussed.
3.1 Understanding Metaphors

Correct understanding of a metaphor is the key element to further actions. Only when its meaning is properly understood, it can be used correctly. Roger White (1996) elaborated on the topic of using metaphors in speech focusing on the necessity to understand them properly:

In metaphor, by combining words in an unusual way, we can do something highly creative, and succeed in saying something that we could not say without recourse to metaphor. At the very least, a starting point for a correct understanding of metaphor is an explicit understanding of the mode of combination of words in metaphor. (p. 2)

3.1.1 Linguistic Competence

In connection to correct understanding, many scholars claim it is not difficult for speakers to understand and use metaphors as it is part of their linguistic competence. Hawkes (1972) claimed that speakers thought of metaphors as “a decorative additive to language, to be used in specific ways, and at specific times and places. It will also be noticed that 'clarity' is presumed to reside in 'ordinary' language, which is non-metaphorical“ (p. 8).

In addition to that, Parmegiani (1987) suggested speakers had another sub-linguistic competence. “If metaphorization occurs as a regular phenomenon of ordinary communication, there is no reason to believe there does not really exist a lexical system – a kind of “metaphorical competence“ - that co-exists along with the 'core' literal one” (p. 3). Therefore, it means metaphors are linguistically on the same level as ordinary words which are in most cases easily understood and recycled. However, Parmegiani (1987) said that Chomsky (e.g. 1964) “has admitted that metaphor is to be considered a kind of semi-grammatical phenomenon, which violates semantic rules, but which becomes a part of ordinary language competence through a change in the meaning of the referents” (p. 2). And Stern (2000) added to that saying that “the character of a metaphor is a hybrid" (pp. 105-106). Despite the scholars cannot agree on the grammatical category a metaphor fits in they present speakers' ability to understand metaphors as gained during the process of first language learning.
3.1.2 Meaning

Apart from correct understanding and usage, creating new metaphors is a part of speakers' language skills. To be able to invent a new metaphor, the speaker should be aware of two things; it is the combination of words within the metaphor itself and the meaning of the words used.

White (1996) made a point about this issue:

The significance of a metaphor is not fixed by the meanings of the words in the metaphor alone, or that the significance of a metaphor is underdetermined by the meanings of the words. Underdetermination, taken strictly would involve the idea that the same sentence could be used to express two different metaphors, even though all the words in the sentence are taken in precisely the same sense. If this can be so, which metaphor is being expressed on a particular occasion may depend on considerations other than the mere reflections on the words and their meanings. (p. 88)

White also introduced the discussion of several linguists about the meaning of the words used in creating metaphors.

3.1.2.1 Two Meanings of the Words

The majority of scholars have agreed that metaphors have two meanings and the speaker must know the literal meaning in order to know, guess or presume the metaphorical meaning. Binkley (1974) pointed out that "a metaphor cannot be understood as a metaphor unless one can understand the literal meaning of the words used to make the metaphors. The meaning of the metaphor rests upon awareness of literal meaning" (p. 174).

Cohen (1978) offered similar explanation as Binkley, "Metaphor is one of a variety of uses of language in which what is communicated is not what the words mean literally. This characteristic of 'indirectness' is not sufficient to distinguish metaphors from other non-standard uses of language" (p. 2). He supported his argument by claiming that "when it becomes possible to list this so-called metaphorical meaning as a separate meaning, this will show that the metaphor has frozen or died, which is to say that it is no longer a metaphor (p. 14). His point makes sense since metaphor can be characterized as not saying the truth, i.e. not meaning what the words truly mean. Binkley (1974) supposed that "metaphorical expressions are abnormal or non-standard uses of language
and that their falsity is a consequence of this fact“ (p. 171).

Also, in Johnson’s Dictionary, the explanation of the word metaphor is in favour of this opinions since it says that “Metaphor: The application of a word to a use to which, in its original import, it cannot be put.” In addition to that, it is Moore (1982), too, who claimed about metaphors that there were three fundamental assumptions usually made:

First, that metaphor involves some deviation from ordinary and straightforward usage; secondly, that this deviation is semantic involving a change of meaning; and thirdly, that the effect of such semantic deviation is to draw attention to similarities between what the metaphorical expression would ordinary denote and that to which it is metaphorically applied. (p. 1)

White’s (1996) brief account on this matter summarizes the arguments of these scholars: “The key to understanding the way metaphor works is to understand the way words have been combined in the metaphorical sentence” (p. 4).

### 3.1.2.2 One Meaning of the Words

On the other hand, there are some scholars who argue that the words used in metaphors have only the literal meaning. The linguist who is the main advocate of this theory is Davidson.

David Davidson (1978) stated several points:

Metaphors mean what the words, in their most literal interpretation, mean, and nothing more...The central mistake against which I shall be inveighing is the idea that a metaphor has, in addition to its literal sense or meaning, another sense or meaning...The concept of metaphor as primarily a vehicle for conveying ideas, even if unusual ones. (p. 32)

Even though he denies the existence of metaphorical meanings he agrees there are metaphors; chunks of words not used in the usual way.

Steward (1985), in his article, talked about another scholar, Madison, who, in his opinion, “seems, in fact, to have accepted the dichotomy between essentialism and relativism in accepting the distinction between metaphorical meaning (relativism) and literal meaning (essentialism)” (p. 703). Thus, it can be claimed that Madison used to be another advocate of the one meaning theory but has changed his mind.

It is true that Davidson (1978) suggested that there might be other meanings
beside the basic, literal one but neither gave any further detail nor named it. He just pointed out, “In metaphor certain words take on new, or what are often called 'extended' meanings” (p. 34). Despite all that, he and his supporters are in minority in comparison to those who prefer two meanings of the words used in metaphors.

### 3.1.3 Polarity

In connection to the argument about different number of meanings of the words used in metaphors White offers another theory regarding the way their meaning can be looked at. It is the principle of polarity. White (1996) explained that:

In these theories, the attempt is made, in some mysterious way, to locate the polarity within a single word. In addition to its normal sense, we are to ascribe to the word a second, magical, sense. We try to do justice to the special effects that can only be achieved by the use of metaphor, by making this sense special. In the process, we inevitably destroy the pretensions of this special sense to being the sense of a word at all (p. 165).

His theory is based on the assumption that metaphors are mainly used in special situations and, thus, the words must have special meaning as well.

### 3.1.4 Experience

Another issue connected to the matter of proper understanding of metaphors is experience. Despite the fact this issue will be addressed in more details later in connection with culture, it cannot be omitted in this section. Some scholars claim that the way of proper understanding metaphors is to experience the words.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) supported this matter:

The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another. Arguments and wars are different kinds of things – verbal discourse and armed conflict – and the actions performed are different kinds of action. But argument is partially structured, understood, performed, and talked about in terms of war. (p. 5)
On the other hand, there are words and metaphors that cannot be experienced or it is hardly possible to do so, such as warfare. In the past, many people could have fought in a battle but, nowadays, rows and arguments must usually suffice.

### 3.1.5 Presuppositions

There is also another way of getting to know the correct meaning of the words used in metaphors and it is the issue of presuppositions. They have a few advantages over experience. First, it is the degree of presupposition required to be able to understand a metaphor. Second, there are various possibilities the hearer can gain a presupposition.

Stern (2000) denied the prefix itself of the word presupposition:

> Presuppositions need not be presupposed: they need not be held in common in advance of or initial to the time of the utterance that presupposes them. Instead a speaker may come to make a presupposition only after, or as a consequence of the fact that, she utters a sentence expressing a proposition whose appropriateness is contingent on the presupposition. (p. 119)

Therefore, it is convenient for the hearer since they may become familiar with the presupposition before, during or even after a particular utterance or metaphor and still understand it without difficulties.

He also points out that many presupposition are part of speakers' 'common knowledge' (p. 117) as he calls it assuming that it is shared by the speakers of a particular language and, thus, the coding and decoding of the utterances is easy.

To express it in more details, Stern (2000) said that:

> According to the pragmatic notion proffered by Stalnaker and others, we explain the linguistic presuppositions of sentences not in terms of semantic relations between their propositional contents, but by features of their use or properties of their users. The pragmatic notion is guided by two central ideas. The first is that presupposition is a psychological attitude like belief. The second is that a central function of presupposition is to constitute the context on which are appropriateness of an utterance depends. That is, unlike the semantic notion that takes presuppositions to be required for truth-valuedness, the pragmatic
notion requires them for appropriateness. Furthermore, the presuppositions of a sentence that are required for its appropriateness are ultimately to be defined in terms of the presuppositions that a speaker must make for his utterance of the sentence to be appropriate. (p. 117)

Here, he presents the problem of various cultures and their 'common knowledge' which will be dealt with towards the end of this thesis.

3.1.6 Ambiguity

When discussing understanding and various meanings, the concept of ambiguity cannot be left out. As has been already said, the hearer or the reader is supposed to know certain things in order to decode the utterance correctly. In addition, it is the speaker or the writer who is powerful enough to either avoid ambiguity by saying exactly what they want to transfer or deliberately cause it. The latter is elaborated on by White (1996):

...wishes to leave it for the reader unclear which is meant, and simply wishes the reader to confront the alternative possible readings, or because a deliberate ambiguity is aimed at, in which the reader is to accept two alternative readings in tension. If this is so, then we cannot identify a metaphor with its public expression, but to accept that the thoughts which issued in the public utterance, and which the utterance is designed to provoke, are just as constitutive of the metaphor as the utterance itself. We cannot even say that the metaphor is the sentence as intended, since the person uttering the sentence may, as we have just seen, intend that their utterance should simultaneously express more than one metaphor. (p. 104)

Furthermore, there may be another option and that is when the speaker wants or does not want to cause ambiguity but the transference fails somehow and the hearer understands it perfectly or is totally lost. This may be due to different age, culture or social background.

Also, Davidson (1978) pointed out fourth possibility, "Metaphor as a kind of ambiguity: in the context of a metaphor, certain words have either a new or an original meaning, and the force of the metaphor depends on our uncertainty as we waver between the two meanings" (p. 35). During a period of time some words may get a new or modified meaning and, again, it is up to the speaker to decide whether to risk it and say it or, rather, use different words.
Another way of possible confusion is using words which have more connotations – positive, negative or both. In this case, again, the hearer faces ambiguity since there is a range of attributes to chose from.

3.1.7 Punning

Talking about metaphors, playing with language or punning cannot be omitted either since it is sometimes necessary to do that in order to understand a metaphor. White explained that we have to treat a word as being used simultaneously in two different senses, we clearly have no alternative but to assign to this one word a double use within the metaphor (1996, p. 25). Again, playing with language involves understanding of the possible meanings of the words used.

White (1996) stated that:

Normally when we talk of a pun, we mean a sentence which has at least two different meanings, stemming from different possible senses than can be given to some of the words it contains. Here, we are concerned with an effect generated by the fact that a word bears two different senses but not in such a way as to make the resulting comparison established by the metaphor is perfectly sharp and unequivocal. Taking the word in two different senses is required to specify the two terms of a single comparison, not to generate a metaphor involving two comparisons. (p. 27)

For non-native speakers such games can cause trouble either because they do not have the necessary knowledge or there is a barrier connected to their culture or mother tongue.

3.1.8 Understanding of the Metaphors of War

Applying the theories which have been introduced to metaphors of war used in Business English, it can be said that the majority of the metaphors have both literal and metaphorical meaning. When telling somebody to, for instance, *hold a fort*, *fight a losing battle* and *weapon*, they are not expected to take a gun and do something with it but, rather, it is the metaphorical meaning the speaker is implying. On the other hand, a few expressions, such as *plan a*
strategy, can easily have only the literal meaning. Still, this is probably due to the overlap of those two, literal and metaphorical, meanings.

As far as experience is concerned, it can be claimed that the majority of managers and others who use Business English have never fought in a battle nor in a war. However, it is the presupposition, the 'common knowledge' that help people understand what a particular metaphor means. An army of managers, wipe out or call a truce is perfectly understood due to a vast number of films, publications and other transmitters that help to imagine the experience.

In connection to experience, punning too is connected to the artificial experience people may gain nowadays without any drops of blood. Also, due to this, ambiguity is not likely to happen since we can imagine the meaning. Even though some people have never fought, battled, wrestled, struggled or grappled with in the physical way they consider these metaphors as words expressing 'work hard to achieve something' and nothing else.

3.1.8.1 Metaphors of attack and defence

In connection to the experience, real or artificial, it is possible to decide whether the sample of the hundred selected metaphors are of offensive or defensive nature, or 'metaphors of defence and offence' as Seitel (2008, p. 55) called them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFENSIVE</th>
<th>DEFENSIVE/ LOSING</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punch through the</td>
<td>Admit defeat</td>
<td>Army</td>
<td>Arsenal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack every weak</td>
<td>Execute</td>
<td>Contingent</td>
<td>Be sb's worst enemy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack a position</td>
<td>Give in</td>
<td>Host</td>
<td>Be sb's adversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>Give up without a fight</td>
<td>Regiment</td>
<td>Calibre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be in a superior</td>
<td>Hold the fort</td>
<td>Casulty</td>
<td>Enlist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be in the high</td>
<td>Invisible fortress</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Fight a losing battle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>command</td>
<td>around</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach the fortress</td>
<td>Keep sb's head down</td>
<td>Gauge</td>
<td>Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a minefield</td>
<td>Lose a fight</td>
<td>In a no win situation</td>
<td>Foot soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat</td>
<td>Protective strategy</td>
<td>Marching orders</td>
<td>Join forces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a result of this research it can be claimed that there is a vast majority of metaphors of offence, some of them are metaphors of defence or losing, there is about the same number of metaphors that can be used in both offensive and defensive/losing context, and a few neutral metaphors such as those dealing with peace or dead-end situations.
It is not surprising, however, that there is the majority of metaphors of offence since it resembles the environment of business where every company and its managers and employees do their best to succeed and earn more and more money which in a military situation would mean to win a war or a battle losing as a small number of soldiers as possible and hoping to get as much a booty as possible. In connection to that, being in a defensive position can mean be losing and that is the reason these two types of metaphors are listed in the same group.
3.2 Structure of Metaphors

As far as the structure of metaphors is concerned, scholars have been analysing it from various perspectives – the structure within metaphors themselves as well as the sentences metaphors naturally occur in. In the following chapters the outer and inner structure will be examined respectively.

3.2.1 Primary and Secondary Sentences

Even though a metaphor can be mostly understood on its own, e.i. without being incorporated into a sentence, the sentence can help the listener to get the correct meaning, to ensure them. In connection to that, White (1996) pointed out:

In saying that a metaphor is a sentence that may be regarded as a conflation of two other sentences, we cannot be taken to be giving a direct description of the metaphorical process. What we are doing is introducing such sentences as an auxiliary construction, that gives us a technique for representing the linguistic structure of the metaphorical sentence. (p. 110)

According to White, it is unlikely to speak using metaphors without putting them into sentences in normal life. Still, they are an aid, rather than a necessity. However, he divided the sentences into two types – primary and secondary sentences. White (1996) explained the need to introduce the two types:

The fact that metaphor is underdetermined in the sense that the metaphorical sentence does not specify a unique primary and secondary sentence for that metaphor, but only in the limited sense that there is considerable legitimate variation in the choices that have to be made, where the variation is legitimate precisely because it is idle, because it has no effect on the significance of the metaphor. But metaphors may be underdetermined in a more radical, and more interesting, sense than this. There are cases where the same sentence will support two different readings, and where the metaphorical sentence could generate, apparently quite intelligibly, two different pairs of primary and
secondary sentences, and where the choice of the one pair rather than the other has a considerable effect on the whole significance of the metaphor. The resulting ambiguity in such cases can only be solved, if at all, by bringing in a wide variety of extra-linguistic considerations. (p. 93)

Therefore, it can be claimed that sentences are the most helpful when the metaphor is not clear and there is a thread the listener will misunderstand it.

To explain the two terms, a primary sentence and a secondary sentence, White (1996) said that both sentences were "ordinary, literal, sentences; but, typically, whereas a primary sentence does not describe an actual situation; what does it present us with an hypothetical situation, with which the actual situation is to be compared" (p. 111); and thus, even though metaphors are part of secondary sentences, primary sentences and primary meanings of the words can help to determine the meaning.

In addition to that, White has pointed out that:

The device of constructing primary and secondary sentences is simply a way of rendering explicit the double life enjoyed by the words within the metaphor itself, and is simply a representation of an internal drama performed by the actual words of the metaphor themselves. Theories of the metaphorical senses of words can be best viewed as an inappropriate response to this dual role of words within a metaphor. Noticing that words are used in metaphor in an unusual way, one gives a simplistic description of that unusual use by assuming that the word has changed its normal sense, thereby travestying the trick that we actually perform with words here, a trick that can be described with assuming that the words are used in any other senses that their standard, dictionary, meanings. (p. 116)

Thus, it can be said that even though metaphors may promise ambiguity, there should be a hint an ambiguity is included and, therefore, its meaning cannot be easily found.
3.2.1.1 Primary and Secondary sentences in Metaphors of War in Business English

To illustrate White's theory on metaphors of war used in Business English, it can be assumed that war expressions used in sentences regarding war can be considered to be primary sentences, and secondary sentences are those in which war expressions are used in their metaphorical meaning. Such as *The enemy's fortress will have been conquered by tonight.* and *The new marketing strategy will conquer the targeted public once it has been launched.* *The army of archers approached the city.* and *The army of managers will be arriving at the conference shortly.* And lastly, *The troops retreated from their trenches.* and *The new car advertisement has retreated from public sight due to its violent part.*

3.2.2 Primary and Secondary Vocabulary

Similarly to the categorization of sentences, the words used to make metaphors can be also divided into two groups: primary and secondary vocabulary. Is it White who introduced and explored these types. Firstly, White (1996) expressed the reason he had created these two types:

In general, when we speak of a metaphor, we are referring to a sentence or another expression, in which some words are used metaphorically, and some are used non-metaphorically. Ignoring for the moment the possibility of mixed metaphor, I agree that a metaphor contains words used in two different kinds of ways. A first approximation to the difference would be to say that some of the words are such that they would naturally be used in a straightforward, literal, description of the situation that is being metaphorically presented, and some of the words are used to establish the metaphorical comparison at work. Since talking of words being used metaphorically may be misleading, carrying with it overtones of 'words used in a metaphorical sense', and since, in any case, I wish to insist that the *whole sentence* establishes the metaphor, in what follows,
I shall say: a metaphor contains two different kinds of vocabulary, a primary vocabulary, consisting of those words that would belong in a straightforward, non-metaphorical, description of the situation being metaphorically presented, and a secondary vocabulary that introduces the metaphorical comparison into the sentence. (p. 17)

As it can be observed, White implied the same rules as he did in the case of sentences. The words which have their first, literal meaning are a part of primary vocabulary and those used in metaphorical way belong to secondary vocabulary.

In addition, it is presumed a metaphor should include both types of vocabulary for purely linguistic reasons.

White (1996) claimed that:

Most metaphors contain both words belonging to the primary vocabulary and words belonging to the secondary vocabulary. It is obvious why we cannot have the one-limit case, a metaphor in which no word belongs to the secondary vocabulary; we would then have not a metaphor, but a purely literal utterance, and we would be provided with no hints to suggest an appropriate secondary sentence. (p. 83)

Therefore, secondary vocabulary, which is closely connected to secondary sentence, is vital for the concept of metaphors from the linguistic point of view.

White (1996) added:

Once we grasp the way in which the one sentence is composed of these two vocabularies at work in metaphor become clarified, to be replaced eventually by an exact statement; in the process, much about the phenomenon of metaphor itself stands out in high relief. (p. 18)

Therefore, it is the listener's communication ability to distinguish primary and
secondary vocabulary in order to recognize they are dealing with a metaphor and, hence, the words might not really mean what they normally do.

### 3.2.2.1 Primary and Secondary Vocabulary in Metaphors of War

Since the hundred examples chosen mainly consist of a single word derived from military terminology to which another word or words can be added if necessary, they primarily include secondary vocabulary only. In other words, secondary vocabulary items are vital parts of metaphors and the number primary vocabulary items can vary according to the speaker's wish.

No matter, there are several multiple-word metaphors in which this theory can be applied to:

- **attack** | every weak point  
  secondary | primary vocabulary

- **attack** | a position  
  secondary | primary vocabulary

- **breach** | the fortress  
  primary | secondary vocabulary

- **bombard** | with inquiries  
  secondary | primary vocabulary

- **bleed** | dry  
  secondary | primary vocabulary

- **get** | marching orders  
  primary | secondary vocabulary

- **hold** | the fortress  
  primary | secondary vocabulary
Out of these ten examples selected at random, it is obvious no particular pattern can be observed except for the facts that if a secondary vocabulary item is a verb, it is always followed by a primary vocabulary item and vice versa; if a secondary vocabulary item is a noun, it follows a primary vocabulary item.

Indeed, it can be also claimed that a secondary vocabulary item is usually embraced by primary vocabulary items. Nevertheless, the distinction must be made between the words belonging to a metaphor and the others creating a sentence since the latter do not necessarily have impact on or direct connection to a secondary vocabulary item.

3.2.3 Target and Source

The inner structure of metaphors has been also dealt with by Goatly. He discussed two types of words used to create a metaphor using the terms Topic and Source.

Goatly (2007) described his ideas:
From a cognitive perspective metaphor can be briefly defined as thinking of one thing (A) as though it were another thing (B), and linguistically this will result in an item of vocabulary or larger stretch of text being applied in an unusual or new way. In traditional terminology A is the Topic or Target and B is the Vehicle or Source. To distinguish metaphors from other figures of speech we must stipulate that metaphorical thinking of a target in terms of a source involves
establishing some similarity or analogy linking A and B. This process can be called Mapping and the similarities or analogical relationships found can be called the Grounds (p. 11).

From Goatly's point of view, it can be observed that source is the word used as a base, the word whose metaphorical meaning can be applied to target, the word affected by this metaphorical meaning.

3.2.3.1 Target and Source in Metaphors of War

Applying Goatly's theory on metaphors of war, it can be claimed that military expressions function like a source and words which are part of a metaphor or affected by it are a target since there are the important ideas being communicated.

- capture | market
- source | target
- indefensible | claims
- source | target
- set | targets
- target | source
- somebody is someone's | adversary
- target | source
- something is | a minefield
- target | source
- take | a lot of flak
- target | source
task | force
target | source

win | tender
source | target

half | the battle
target | source

invisible fortress | around something
source | target

From these examples it can be observed that the positions of source-target and target-source differ according to the position of words they characterise and that there is no regular pattern which prevails. However, as Kovëcses (2002) pointed out, “metaphors typically employ a more abstract concept as target and a more concrete or psychical concept as their source” (p. 6) and this concept can be easily applied to metaphors of war too since often sources, the expressions somehow connected to warfare, can be imagined more easily than the expression representing targets.

3.2.4 Focus and Frame

The third terminology which applies to words forming metaphors, again, deals with two terms – focus and frame. It is White who dealt with the terminology and supported his arguments by another scholar's work. Similarly, as it has been shown with primary and secondary vocabulary, and target and source, focus and frame, again, study words from the point of view of their meaning.

White (1996) expressed the usage of the terms:

In Black's terminology, the unity of a metaphor would, of course, be supposed to be guaranteed by the fact that the metaphor had a single focus. Now, since all his examples are examples of metaphors containing one word, or a simple phrase, being used metaphorically, that notion appears itself unproblematic; but
once we turn to the example before us with its intermingling of metaphorical and non-metaphorical vocabulary, everything becomes opaque. We may simply ask: 'What is the focus of this metaphor meant to be?' On most plausible readings, the metaphorical words do not go together to form a single quotable phrase, but are interspersed with non-metaphorical words. (p. 15)

Using the concept of focus and frame can be mostly useful when a metaphor is ambiguous. This is similar to the usage of target and source, the terminology Goatly used.

White (1996) offered the definitions of the two terms:

According to Black’s framework, a metaphor is constituted by a focus within a frame, with the focus gaining a metaphorical meaning from its interaction with the frame. What this amounts to is only ever examined for the case where the focus is the single word or phrase, but the present example does not, in this way, offer us such a focus (p. 59).

Thus, focus as well as target deals with the main point or idea communicated and frame as well as source is the expression conveying its metaphorical meaning to the former named.

As far as the classification is concerned, it is necessary to be aware of the usage of the words in metaphors.

White (1996) summed it up:

Attempt to locate a focus in a metaphor shows the task of distinguishing between words being used metaphorically, and words used non-metaphorically, to be far more problematic than Black begins to imagine. The distinction, on which Black’s formula essentially depends, between ‘words being used metaphorically’ and ‘words used non-metaphorically’, stands in great need of clarification, where nothing Black says shows he is even aware of such a need, let alone does anything to supply it. (p. 14)

In can be claimed that, thus, the way words are classified within a metaphor is approximately the same. The only thing that differs is the naming.

3.2.4.1 Focus and Frame in Metaphors of War

As has been said above, the concept of focus and frame is similar to the concept of target and source and, therefore, the same examples will be used to prove that.
Similarly, there is no regular pattern as far as the frequency of focus-frame or frame-focus is concerned since it depends on the parts of speech and their position within a sentence.
3.3 Conceptual Metaphor and Its Types

Looking at metaphors from the point of view of cognitive linguistics, there is a numerous group called conceptual metaphors which have several subcategories. In the following chapters these types of metaphors will be discussed in more detail.

3.3.1 Conceptual Metaphors In General

To start with the most general type, conceptual metaphors, their main focus as well as their connection to the theories introduced in previous chapters shall be commented on. First, the reason metaphors are called conceptual was explained by Kovécses (2002):

The cognitive linguistics view maintains that – in addition to objective, pre-existing similarity – conceptual metaphors are based on a variety of human experience, including correlations in experience, various kinds of non-objective similarity, biological and cultural roots shared by the two concepts, and possibly others. (p. 69)

He expressed that even though experience is vital in order to explain and understand a metaphor, one should be aware of possible different cultural background.

For the reason they is a very broad category, they “can be classified according to the level of generality at which they can be found” (Kovécses, 2002, p. 38). This generality is connected to two terms or, rather, domains which have been already presented; target and source.

Kovécses (2002) also pointed out that:

A conceptual metaphor consists of two conceptual domains, in which one domain is understood in terms of another. A conceptual domain is any coherent organization of experience. The two domains that participate in conceptual metaphor have special names. The conceptual domain from which we draw
metaphorical expressions to understand another conceptual domain is called source domain, while the conceptual domain that is understood this way is the target domain. (p. 4)

As has been already said above, target and source are important concepts so that the meaning of metaphors can be transferred correctly. Furthermore, it is said that these domains are also based on experience.

As far as experience is concerned, Davidson and Kovëcses elaborated on this topic. Davidson (1978) called this experience a commonplace claiming that “according to Black's interpretation theory, a metaphor makes us apply a 'system of commonplaces' associated with the metaphorical word to the subject of the metaphor. We apply commonplace attributes of the ... to ...“ (p. 44).

Kovëcses (2002) named it 'additional knowledge' stating:

When rich additional knowledge about a source is mapped onto a target, we call it metaphorical entailment to distinguish it from most of the mappings we have seen so far. The examination of conceptual metaphors shows that many metaphors do map additional knowledge from the source onto the target. (p. 94)

Both scholars agree on the issue of experience, no matter how they call it, and thus, results can be derived from their ideas. It can be claimed that due to personal and cultural experience, there is a link between, for instance, war heroes who represent the abstract concept and bosses or great leaders who represent the concrete concept since it is expected both have similar qualities in order to have achieved their status.

In addition to that, Kovëcses (2002) discussed possible links among targets and sources:

How many and what kind of target domains does a single source concept apply
to? I will call this issue the question of the scope of metaphor. By the scope of
metaphors I simply mean the range of cases, that is, the target domains, to
which a given source concept applies. (p. 108)

Kovècses showed that a source, in the case of metaphors of war the expression
whose literal meaning has a connection to warfare, can be used in connection
to several targets, e.i. the expression concerning business environment. For
example, it is possible to say *defend a point* as well as *defend employees.* One
source, two different targets can be seen in this example.

### 3.3.2 Types of Conceptual Metaphors

Since conceptual metaphors are based on experience, their types must
be based on it as well. All metaphors also have in common the concept of
similarity, that is the connection between target and source.

Kovècses (2002) named the three basic types:

When we ask what the function of metaphor is for ordinary people in thinking
about and seeing the world, we are asking a question about the cognitive
function of metaphor. Conceptual metaphors can also be classified according to
the cognitive functions that they perform. On this basis, three general kinds of
conceptual metaphor have been distinguished: structural, ontological, and
orientational. (pp. 32-33)

Apart from structural, ontological and orientational metaphors mentioned by
Kovècses, Lakoff and Johnson introduced the concept of new metaphors which
must have a similarity between the concept and experience in order to be
considered conceptual metaphors.

#### 3.3.2.1 Ontological Metaphors

As the name indicates, in these metaphors “similarities are possibly
made” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, pp. 147-8). These similarities are again
made in connection to our experience.
Since experience is part of people's lives and there is a limited number of possibilities where it can be obtained, these metaphors often deal with a kind of personification. Kovčeses (2002) focused on the concepts of these metaphors:

Ontological metaphors provide much less cognitive structuring for target concepts that structural ones do. Their cognitive job seems to be to "merely" give an ontological status to general categories of abstract target concepts. What this simply means is that we conceive of our experiences in terms of objects, substances, and containers, in general, without specifying exactly what kind of object, substance, or container is meant... Ontological metaphors enable us to see more sharply delineated structure where there is very little or none. (p. 34)

He stressed that in the case of ontological metaphors abstract objects and ideas can be perceived in quite a concrete way and dealt with human experience whereas Lakoff and Johnson (1980) discussed non-human issues which could be still in a way experienced saying that possibly "the most obvious ontological metaphors are those where the physical object is further specified as being a person. This allows us to comprehend a wide variety of experiences with non-human entities in terms of human motivations, characteristics, and activities" (p. 33).

As far as metaphors of war in Business English are concerned, there are examples which can be explained in terms of personification or, rather, belong to the group of ontological metaphors. In most cases verbs such as attack, demolish, win, give up, lose or succumb are used in connection to non-human concepts but can be still considered to be part of human experience.
3.3.2.2 Structural Metaphors

The definition of structural metaphors introduced by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) explains them as metaphors which “in our conceptual system also induce similarities” (pp. 147-8). Again, based on experience, they offer the user to make general structures and consequences.

Kovëcses (2002) explained that in structural metaphors “the source domain provides a relatively rich knowledge structure for the target concept. In other words, the cognitive function of these metaphors is to enable speakers to understand target A by means of the structure of source B” (p. 33). The rich knowledge users can work with is influenced by the possibility of making generalizations and structures.

Structural metaphors are also important for creating new metaphors and metaphorical concepts as Lakoff and Johnson (1980) pointed out:

Structural metaphors provide the richest source of such elaboration. Structural metaphors allow us to do much more than just orient concepts, refer to them, quantify them, etc., as we do with simple orientational and ontological metaphors; they allow us, in addition, to use one highly structured and clearly delineated concepts to structure another. (p. 61)

Similarly, no elaboration can be provided if there is no experience to base an elaboration on.

To illustrate the usage on metaphors of war, it can be observed some structures can be created too. For example, when talking about a war or a battle, many speakers imagine a particular battle they have seen in a film or have read about and, subsequently, generalize it into two basic units – the winner and the loser - since in the majority of cases there has not been anything in the middle and, even though a truce is called, the conditions are more convenient for one party, hence the winner. Also, a rational argumentations business environment is full of, can be associated with war; in both cases there is a strategy planned in advance, a sequence of attacks and defences and, in the end, the winner and the loser.
3.3.2.3 Orientational Metaphors

Orientational metaphors are based on experience people have been acquiring during their lives even though they have not sought it since everybody by reaching a certain age has got the sense of spatial orientation and the way of approaching it.

Kovëcses (2002) presented an overview of this group of metaphors:

Orientational metaphors provide even less conceptual structure for target concepts than ontological ones. Their cognitive job, instead, is to make a set of target concepts coherent in our conceptual system. The name “orientational metaphor” derives from the fact that most metaphors that serve this function have to do with basic human spatial orientations. (p. 35)

From the business as well as, in some cases, ordinary life point of view, there are certain directions that are associated with good situation and some with bad.

Goatly (2007) specified the association between a certain situation and a direction:

One of the most important clusters of conceptual metaphors or metaphor themes in the English language builds on activity or process is movement forwards, and ramifies into other equations such as developing/succeeding in moving forward, intense activity is speed, success/ease is speed and activity/competition is race. (p. 51)

On the other hand, in business movement backwards can indicate bad financial situation or uncertain situation on the market.

In connection to the movement forward, the level of speed is also important in order to specify given success or failure. When approaching it fast, extra credit can be given to a particular success and vice versa. Goatly (2007) said that “these speed metaphors for intensity or high rated of activity tend to
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double up as metaphors for success. In fact, etymologically, before it meant velocity, Old English *spede* meant 'success' or 'prosperity'" (p. 52).

As far as metaphors of war in Business English are concerned, the image of movement indicated success or failure since it is based on human experience. Examples such as *retreat, attack, manoeuvre* and *conquer* give both the impression what direction is meant as well as success of such an action. Furthermore, there are some examples which indicate both direction and speed such as *bomb*.

### 3.3.3 New Metaphors

As has been mentioned above, new conceptual metaphors can be created. From the point of view of both linguistics and experience, it is mostly structural metaphors being created.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) focused on the process of creation as well as its reasons:

New metaphors are mostly structural. They can create similarities in the same way as conventional metaphors that are structural. That is, they can be based on similarities that arise from ontological and orientational metaphors. New metaphors, by virtue of their entailments, pick out a range if experiences by highlighting, downplaying, and hiding. The metaphor then characterizes a similarity between the entire range of highlighted experiences and some other range of experiences. (p. 152)

Therefore, it can be claimed that new metaphors may introduce a new view on a particular concept or some expressions might be played with.

There can be new metaphors of war in Business English that involve playing with language too, even though the number of new expressions is limited by warfare expressions and the speaker's knowledge of them. For instance, a sentence such as *On Christmas Day customers are catapulted by huge sales* can be created associating the image of countless sales and big iron balls being thrown at innocent people or town.
3.4 Cultural and Social Issues in Metaphors

Conceptual metaphors are based on experience which enables speakers to both understand and create metaphors as any utterances and words. The range of the experience a speaker can gain is as wide as the particular culture allows it. Hence, conceptual metaphors are closely connected to the culture of speakers.

3.4.1 Cultural Experience in General

Since experience is rooted in a culture, this aspect will be focused on in connection to language users and possible limitations emerging from a particular culture. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) examined the way speakers' lives influenced our linguistic competence and vice versa:

All metaphors have a strong cultural basis. They emerged naturally in a culture like ours because what they highlight corresponds so closely to what we experience collectively and what they hide corresponds to so little. But not only are they grounded in our physical and cultural experience; they also influence our experience and our actions. (p. 68)

Furthermore, it can be claimed that since metaphors are the results of a culture, their translation to foreign languages can be sometimes quite difficult due to different connotations and tradition influenced by the culture of the language users.

This problem does not have to be usually perceived by speakers of the culture metaphors have emerged from. Stern (2000) explained that interpreters of metaphors living in the same culture “perform them with the same naturalness, ease, and sense of competent comfortableness with which they interpret other kinds of utterances. Most of the time they succeed in interpreting even the most novel and imaginative metaphors without special difficulty” (p. 1). Thus, speakers do not have to be aware of metaphors at all
and, still, understand and interpret them without difficulties.

As far as the link between culture and experience is concerned, the experience speakers have enables them not only to use it directly but also to modify it or make it more general.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) explored the connection between target and source, commonly known as grounding:

Perhaps the most important thing to stress about grounding is the distinction between an experience and the way we conceptualize it. We are not claiming that physical experience is in any way more basic than other kinds of experience, whether emotional, mental, cultural, or what-ever. All of these experiences may be just as basic as physical experiences. Rather, what we are claiming about grounding in that we typically conceptualize the non-physical in terms of physical – that is, we conceptualize the less clearly delineated in terms of the more clearly delineated. (p. 59)

They stress the language ability of speakers to play with a grounding in order to be still able to get the meaning as well as create new concepts. Lakoff and Johnson carried on explaining that “the less clearly delineated (and usually less concrete) concepts are partially understood in terms of the more clearly delineated (and usually more concrete) concepts, which are directly grounded in our experience” (1980, p. 109). They focused on the ability of speakers to elaborate on various abstract concepts having a concrete experience and vice versa.

Therefore, culture and experience are the eyes of interpreters looking at a metaphors trying to define its purpose.

Seitel (2008) focused on this connection from an abstract point of view:

Studying metaphors can uncover basic underlying principles that people use to conceive of and evaluate their own speech interactions. As metaphor is a movement from one semantic domain to another, a study of metaphors shows how a given society moves between its indigenously defined domains. If the
metaphors are limited to those involving speech, we can use them to analyse indigenously perceived astructural homologies between language and other aspects of culture. (p. 66)

He stressed the importance of culture and cultural experience as the matter of a process which had been stretching for years and centuries showing that domains developed in connection to events a culture has experienced.

3.4.2 Cultural Experience in Orientational Metaphors

Interpreters of orientational metaphors should be aware of possible misunderstanding when using these metaphors in conversation with foreigners since it is the culture speakers live in that influences the way “our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 3).

Thus, the knowledge of culture goes hand in hand with the knowledge of language since culture may influence the meaning of utterances and metaphors. This is the case of orientational metaphors. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) pointed out that “in general, the major orientations up-down, in-out, central-peripheral, active-passive, etc., seem to cut across all cultures, but which concepts are oriented which way and which orientation are most important vary from culture to culture” (p. 4) stressing the importance that “not all cultures give the priorities we do up-down orientation. There are cultures where balance or centrality plays a much more important role than it does in our culture” (p. 24).

Since “spatialization metaphors are rooted in physical and cultural experience; they are not randomly assigned” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p.18), people from one country must pay attention to the culture of the foreigner they are talking to in order to avoid an embarrassing situation or misunderstanding. Sometimes, this rule can be applied not to countries, but smaller units such as regions or cities, and conversely, bigger units such as parts of a continent or continents. It is all connected to tradition and history a culture has experienced.
3.4.3 Verbal battles

To illustrate the influence of cultural experience on the perception of language, arguments are the best example since in Western culture arguments are often seen as the metaphors of ARGUMENT IS WAR.

Applying the abstract concept of war into real life situations, people arguing are perceived as two sides, or enemies, trying to enforce their arguments.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) pointed out verbal battles had been omnipresent:

Such verbal battles are comprehended in much the same terms as physical battles. Take a domestic quarrel, for instance. Husband and wife are both trying to get what each of them wants, such as getting the other to accept a certain viewpoint on some issues or at least to act according to that viewpoint. Each sees himself as having something to win and something to lose, territory to establish and territory to defend. In a no-holds-barred argument, you attack, defend, counterattack, etc., using whatever verbal means you have at your disposal – intimidation, threat, invoking authority, insult, belittling, challenging authority, evading issues, bargaining, flattering, and even trying to give „rational reasons.“ but all of these tactics can be, and often are, presented are reasons. (p. 62)

Since every day quarrels can be described using military expressions, no wonder it can be applied to business environment as well for it is an area where communication, dialogues and arguments are considered to be vital in order to achieve a goal.

In addition, business and war have much in common since usually there is one winner and the others are losers. Hence, the close connection between them.

Nuessel (1987) gave detailed description of the perception of an argument from the military perspective:

Gestalt consists of various recurring subpatterns of the whole structure and can be analysed into these patterns, though to do so destroys the relationships that make the whole structure meaningful for us. The gestalt for 'war', for example, involves the standard subpatterns or dimensions of structure for any action, but they are specified in a way peculiar to way: participants (people/nations are adversaries), parts (two positions, planning strategy, attack, defence
counter-attack, surrender, etc.), stages (one adversary attack, both sides manoeuvre, one side retreats, etc.), causation (attack results in defeat, etc.) and purpose (victory). (p.14)

From this account, the similarities between warfare and having arguments are more than obvious since it is possible to find a connection between every part of an argument and stages of a battle.

In connection to that, cultural experience has taught people that warfare, and, therefore, arguments as well, are a natural part of their existence. This necessity to test own abilities is present in the majority of cultures and even though nowadays a test of strategy and battle skills cannot be easily done, leaving apart some individual fist fights, arguments have taken over.

As Lakoff and Johnson (1980) explained:

There is still a position to be established and defended, you can win or lose, you have an opponent whose position you attack and try to destroy and whose argument you try to shoot down. If you are completely successful, you can wipe him out. The point here is that not only our conception of an argument but the way we carry it out is grounded in our knowledge and experience of physical combat. Even if you have never fought a fistfight in you life, much less a war, but have been arguing from the time you began to talk, you still conceive of arguments, and execute them, according to the argument is war metaphor because the metaphor is built into the conceptual system of the culture in which you live. (pp. 63-64)

According to their point, arguments offer people to go through a new experience even though it is not the original one. Still, such a substitute suffices since it secures basic concepts of the primary experience – losing, winning, taking risks and so on.

3.4.4 Politically Incorrect Metaphors

Despite the fact Business English is targeted at the whole population and, therefore, the language should be international in terms of neutrality and historical and political correctness, there are examples proving that history and experience of the particular culture Business English has invented is a very powerful factor.
As far as English influence is concerned, the most problematic area is the utterances having connection to history since English history contains several battles and wars with other countries. Kövecses (2002) elaborated on the concept of emotions saying that “there can be differences in the range of conceptual metaphors that languages and cultures have available for the conceptualization of particular target domain. This is what commonly happens in the case of emotion concepts as targets” (pp. 103-104). Such emotions can be connected to French and English war and possible expressions, metaphors and idioms derived from this cultural experience.

American influence on Business English is also the matter of history, to put it in detail, the era of colonialism and slavery. Goatly (2006) explained the the basic “metaphor themes GOOD IS CLEAN/ WHITE AND EVIL IS DARK/ BLACK” (p. 26) and was anxious “the prejudice created by these associations between evil, crime and people of African race continues” (p. 46). It is surprising that nowadays, at time people are forced to use politically correct expressions metaphors such as white knight and black knight, its opposite, are still used in business environment. Apart from racial point of view, it can be claimed that the idea of a white thing resembles something positive and good whereas black colour has negative and bad connotation.
4. Conclusion

This thesis has dealt with the issues of understanding metaphorical meaning, the structure of metaphors, various types of metaphors and cultural experience showing that these concepts are interwoven.

The aim of the thesis and its research was to answers these three questions:

1. What is the nature of military metaphors?
2. What is the structure of these metaphors?
3. Are metaphors of war cross-cultural?

4.1 What is the Nature of Military Metaphors?

Military metaphors used in Business English have been compared to warfare in terms of similarities these two concepts share and it has been proven that both in wars as well as in business the movement forward, the courage to attack in order to gain can be found more often than expressions interpreting withdrawing or defence.

According to the research made using all the hundred examples, it can be stated that metaphors of offence prevail (48 examples out of 100). Another 20 examples have been classified as having both offensive and defensive connotation depending on the utterance they are used in even though those metaphors where the offensive aspect is stronger are listed among the offensive. There have been 18 examples of the metaphors of defence and 14 examples belonging to the neutral group of metaphors.

Therefore, it can be claimed it corresponds with reality and human perception of active warfare and the results are expected.

4.2 What is the Structure of These Metaphors?

There have been various types of research dealing with the inner and outer structure of the metaphors.

It has been found out that in spite of the fact there are many terms
regarding inner structure of metaphors, such as primary and secondary vocabulary, frame and focus, target and source, the part of a metaphor containing a military expression is classified as secondary vocabulary item or source or frame whereas the part of a metaphor this military expression applies to belongs to the group of primary vocabulary items or target or source.

As far as the outer structure is concerned, the two terms – primary and secondary sentences – have been introduced. Having carried out a research it can be pointed out that metaphors occur in secondary sentences since for they carry the secondary meaning of some of the words whereas primary sentences contain words presenting their primary, literal meaning.

4.3 Are Metaphors of War Cross-cultural?

In the final part of the thesis cultural experience has been examined in terms of linguistic competence since culture shape speakers' perceiving and understanding of the world and, in connection to that, language and metaphors.

It has been claimed that even though Business English is an internationally used language, its user should be aware of possible difficulties as far as the understanding of metaphors and expressions is concerned. It has been stressed that two cultures of countries can perceive the same event differently according to their experience in the past.

Also, few examples have been presented to show some metaphors are not politically correct and have roots in history.

To answer the question, it can be claimed metaphors of war used in Business English are cross-cultural, however, the interpreter should bare in mind the possibility of misunderstanding caused by different perception of things.
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Appendix: List of Used Metaphors

This list includes all the metaphors research has been based on in the thesis. In addition, it includes an explanatory sentences in which metaphors of war are used in Business Journalism in order to prove their usage in this field. The explanatory sentences have been taken from various sources such as books by Kovëcses, Lakoff and Johnson, and White, Business Dictionary, British National Corpus and New Model Corpus. Some of the examples can be also used as different parts of speech.

A

army (World trends come and go but the army of unemployed grows forever; now economists are predicting that there will be no foreseeable end to the trend of the last few years.)

arsenal (Our advertisers use a full arsenal of marketing techniques.)

to attack every weak point (The senior manager attacked every weak point in his colleague’s argument.)

to attack a position (McDonald’s attacked the position of the KFC, the leading fast food chain in Europe.)

admit defeat (Against the protests of many of their salesmen, then, the Central Authority and Area Boards gave in to government pressure to restrict promotional advertising and hire purchase schemes in order to curtail the over-rapid growth of demand.)

assault (John Smith is preparing to launch the biggest tax assault ever on middle income families while claiming that he does not know what the effect of his tax hike will be on incentives, confidence or on the economy.)

B

to be one’s adversary (The government and union trade leaders should not
be adversaries since they both want to establish a new salary system.)

to be in a superior position (The assumption itself may patently be wrong, but nevertheless it is difficult for people in superior positions to realize that they are just as fallible as those below.)

to be (in the) high command (The AT&T high command were especially eager to enter both the computer business and the world market for telephone equipment.)

to be a minefield (Personal taxation can be a minefield.)

to breach the fortress (Care needs to be taken that the school doesn't breach the fortress of the regulations imposed by the Education Reform Act.)

to beat (In this section we will consider the possibility of being able to beat the market using professional advice.)

to be bombarded with (Thousands of pensioners will probably vote No, after being bombarded with groundless warnings of cuts in their high pensions if the treaty survives.)

to be one's worst enemy (The administration should be the champion of the IFC, not, as during the past few weeks, its worst enemy.)

to battle (With its large population and massive dependence on foreign exchange from oil exports Nigeria is regarded as the most vulnerable of the OPEC countries and has constantly battled to increase its production quota above the 1.3 million barrels per day laid down by OPEC.)

blitz (Sales managers are having a blitz on raising their awareness about new products.)

to bleed (dry) (The World Bank is bleeding the Third World dry.)

black knight (While not particularly welcome, the black knight is considered
the lesser of two evils.)

C

cut (Universities are facing financial cuts.)
campaign (A business course based on a sales campaign is being held next week.)
to call the shots (Car firms bid to call shots)
cohort (If figures are based on the total cohort of entrants to degree programmes then it appears that among some categories of non-traditional students the percentages achieving `good' degrees are somewhat lower.)
to capture the market (Both types of institution acquired other institutions such as estate agents in the late 1980s in an attempt to capture the market for home loans by offering additional services.)
casualty (Last year there were numerous casualties in recession)
contingent (This year, as well as corporate and retail bankers, there were participants from building societies, a contingent from the European Community and, for the first time, 11 members from Eastern Europe, sponsored by the Overseas Development Administration.)
crusade (They are involved in a crusade for equality in wages.)
to colonise (However, the permeability of state agencies to external influence may lead them to serve the interests of private groups, and in extreme cases to become colonised by them.)
to conquer (Even most of South America has conquered inflation and gold-loans have effectively smoothed the market.)
to combat (The government needs to take stronger measures to combat poverty.)
calibre (The most successful firms were far more worried about the calibre of their product designs and materials.)

close in for a kill (Seeing his chance of a profit Emerson moved close in for the kill.)

catapult (Suppose also that, because it has a latent defect, the catapult is not of merchantable quality and that it breaks in use and injures the boy’s eye as a result.)

conflict (This can create a conflict of interest which needs careful management.)

D
to demolish (The boss demolished his argument about the de-industrialisation.)

to disarm (A duress call is used when you are forced by an intruder to disarm your security system.)

to defend (I defended my points during the discussion after the presentation.)

E
to execute (A proposal to introduce a limited order facility to enable clients to execute transactions automatically at pre-set prices.)

to enlist (The prosperous company enlisted several new marketing staff.)

F
to fight a losing battle (A report published today by the Audit Commission says local authorities are fighting a losing battle to bridge the gap between supply of and demand for rented accommodation.)

front (She’s very creative on the sales front.)

front line (The minister is in the front line of the tax break campaign.)
frontier (The frontier AB shows the maximum quantity of goods which the economy can produce for one person given the quantity of goods being produced for the other person.)

foot soldier (She was never promoted much, but over the years she remained one of our most loyal foot soldiers.)

to force into (A good example of dogged determination to try to force into the marketplace an extremely ingenious invention which had been rejected by the consumer, was our pursuit of merulite packings for soft drinks.)

fire power (This is because short professionals tend to concentrate their fire power.)

G
to get marching orders (The original conception of the public corporation was that it had only to be given its marching orders by the political authority and could then be left to pursue the 'national interest' as management saw fit.)

to gauge (You can't necessarily gauge career success by the amount of money you accumulate.)

to give in (Against the protests of many of their salesmen, then, the Central Authority and Area Boards gave in to government pressure to restrict promotional advertising and hire purchase schemes in order to curtail the over-rapid growth of demand.)

to give up without a fight (But why, policyholders may well ask, should they give up without a fight a 40 per cent stake in the business?)

H
to have usual battle with (After having usual battle with Robert Maxwell he bought the News of the World early in January 1969, and at the end of the year
he bought the still failing Sun.)

host (Governments should not interfere by introducing a host of regulations, investigatory bodies, or state-run enterprises.)

to have a position (Dr. Brungardt is the university ’s second faculty member to have a position created under the Regent ’s Faculty of Distinction Program.)

half the battle (One you ask the right survey questions that’s more than half the battle.)

to hold the fort (Certainly it was the view adopted, for example, when we had a 6 month interregnum in Dublin, and it was assumed it was my responsibility to hold the fort.)

I

invisible fortress (No one has been accepted as a member of the board for more than ten year. Getting there is like fighting against an invisible fortress.)

in a no win situation (Like many people we’re in that tenuous position of having fixed incomes, in the face of rising costs. A no win situation.)

indefensible (Your claims are indefensible.)

J

to join forces with (President and CEO Michael Burrows said the company plans to expand its private - label program and to join forces with more retailers.)

K

to keep one’s head down (But it has kept its head down in recent years because of a huge $4 billion corporate debt and a slide in sales.)

knock-out (7. 5 acres hilltop mesa with knockout views of the eastern range - driveway in. Priced below market.)
to kill (Any recipe for a successful reform of local-government finance in Britain should start in similar vein: first kill the poll tax.)

L

to lose a fight (Whatever company accepts the verdict as the first will lose a fight and will be in the red.)

M

move (The cut in interest rates was a wise move.)

to mobilize (For innovating organizations responding to the new challenges of industrial dematurity, the key task is to mobilize those intangible social forces which perpetuate organizational inertia.)

to marshal forces (Microsoft is supposed to marshal its forces after Steve Jobs' death.)

manoeuvre (Further room for manoeuvre is provided by GEMMs’ ability to borrow stock from approved lenders, typically large insurance companies and pension funds.)

to muster (Alternatively, it may be able to muster enough support from SeaCo shareholders to halt the current disposal of assets by Mr Sherwood for its bid with Stena to be fully considered.)

P

protective (Added to all this were wrangles over the Community Budget and the Common Agricultural Policy together with the protective responses which followed in the wake of the oil price recessions of the 1970s and growing foreign competition.)

to plan strategy (The DC chapter of Legal Marketing Association (LMA) today hosted a seminar, Technology Matrix - Building effective knowledge sharing and
using it to plan strategy and track ROI. )

to punch through the defence (Managers tried to punch the defence of the
trade unions with cunning methods.)

R

retreat (The current figure represents a dramatic retreat from the situation of
the early 1970s when large government deficits were financed by the sale of
public sector debt (bills and bonds) to the banking sector.)

to recruit (Several of the engineering companies visited did recruit their
temporary workers on simple fixed-term contracts.)

resistance (Despite some resistance from independent options traders, only
the index contracts are likely to be traded via open outcry on the new trading
floor.)

rank and file (In Holland, the unions made structural adaptations to their own
organisations to meet the needs of the rank and file.)

to reinforce (Because official sanctioning of a rise in interest rates could be
slow, a"funding pause" could result: this led to problems with controlling broad
money, which in turn could reinforce expectations of a rise in interest rates.)

right on target (His criticism of marketing strategy the company introduced
last months were right on target.)

to rank above (Fixed-charge debentures rank above floating-charge
debentures in the event of default, but only floating-charge debenture holders
can ask for a company to be declared insolvent under the 1986 Insolvency Act.)

regiment (To make sure that these components met the quality standards
needed by the main plant, the company despatched, at its own expense, what
they described to us as a regiment of engineers from Detroit, some of whom
stayed down in Brazil for months advising the subcontractors on how to meet the company's standards.)

**Strategy** (In the UK, the Conservative government's medium-term financial strategy introduced in 1980 attempted to do just this.)

to shoot (Racal's share price suddenly shot up by almost a third, despite the fact that the partial flotation would have absolutely no effect on the already-excellent prospects for Vodafone.)

to shoot down (Shares in STC, the communications group, shot down 13p to 329p yesterday after chief executive Arthur Walsh unloaded 500,000 shares, almost half his personal holding.)

to strike down (There it was pointed out by Dillon LJ that inequality of bargaining power was not sufficient on its own to enable a court to strike down a contract.)

to succumb (We all succumb to these tempting offers sometimes: if we think we're getting something cheaper, or for nothing, we'll buy almost anything!)

to strike a blow for (Now it was felt that the General Council of the TUC had struck a blow to maintain minimum wages for all workers by its support of the woollen and worsted textile workers.)

**Spearhead** (The spearhead of their sales drive was cooking and water heating, in which their major competitors were the gas boards.)

to set sights on (Some STM makers have their sights on other markets.)

to set targets (In addition, before implementing a project the company should set targets against which the project can be assessed.)

**Stalemate** (A stalemate would make sure that neither Ford nor GM could
benefit from Jaguar's expertise in the luxury car market but it will not be particularly attractive for investors.)

**to surrender** (Since banks have sold securities to people who surrender deposits for them, then the fixed stock of balances will be larger in proportion.)

**sabotage** (Industrial sabotage is also seen as a similar reaction to a work situation experienced as disagreeable.)

T

**truce** (Even more interventionist was the one-month compulsory truce imposed on prices.)

**to take flak** (Ex-airman takes a lot of flak from Air NZ CEO in the debate.)

**to troop** (We trooped round a number of venture capital funds and discussed the options.)

**task force** (The administration set up its own special task force in order to find an alternative less likely to antagonise the logging industry.)

V

**vanguard** (During the 1930s the UGT railway union was in the vanguard of the Spanish labour movement and had some 49,000 members.)

W

**weapon** (The prime weapon for managing demand is discretionary fiscal policy, with monetary policy being used merely as a back-up to this.)

**to win** (I have never won an argument with my boss.)

**to wipe out** (If you insist on that strategy, he will wipe you out.)

**to withdraw** (It borrows money from a vast number of small savers, who are able to withdraw their money on demand or at short notice.)

**white knight** (Prudential Corporation slipped 3.5p to 195.5p on worries that it
could emerge as Pearl's white knight.)
English Résumé

The purpose of this Bachelor Diploma Thesis is to provide some of the basic linguistics theories targeted at metaphors and, subsequently, to test these theories using a sample of one hundred metaphors of war used in Business English. These metaphors have been chosen from various publications at random and, therefore, represent a generalized tokens of metaphors of war in Business English.

Metaphors of war have been chosen in connection to Business English due to their similarities and the fact these metaphors are used on a daily basis in business environment. Among the similarities, there are stages of preparation as well as action, two most possible outcomes – being a loser or being a winner, and the roles people play in them – employees are foot soldiers and bosses are colonels or, even, war heroes.

The aim of the research is to answer three questions regarding various types of metaphors (offensive and defensive), the inner and outer structure of metaphors as far as words and utterances are concerned, and, lastly, to prove whether these metaphors can be cross-cultural.

And the research has shown that metaphors of offence prevails, as has been presumed due to the similarity of business to warfare. Secondly, it introduced various terms proving, however, they all address the same issue. It can be claimed, in general, that within metaphors, the military expression are part of one category (secondary vocabulary, source, frame) and words military attributes relate to belong to the other classification group (primary vocabulary, target, focus). Lastly, it has been proved that metaphors are cross-cultural even though a speaker must keep in mind the possibility of misunderstanding due to different cultural background.

There is an appendix added to the thesis with the list of the selected metaphors along with sentences proving these military expression are truly used in business environment.
Czech Résumé

Cílem této bakalářské diplomové práce je představit nějaké základní lingvistické teorie, které se zaměřují na metafory, a následně je v praxi otestovat za pomoci vzorku jedné stovky metafor s válečnou tématickou, které se používají v obchodní angličtině. Tyto metafory byly náhodně vybrány z různých publikací, a proto symbolizují obecný vzorek metafor s válečnou tématickou z obchodní angličtiny.

Metafory s válečnou tématickou byly vybrány ve spojitosti s obchodní angličtinou z důvodu jejich podobností a faktu, že jsou tyto metafory denně používány v obchodním prostředí. Mezi podobnosti se řadí stupně příprav i akce, dva nejvíce možné výsledky – vítěz a poražený, a role, které lidé představují – zaměstnanci jsou jako pěšáci a ředitelé a šéfové jsou plukovníci či dokonce váleční hrdinové.

Cílem výzkumu je zodpovědět tři otázky týkající se různých typů metafor (s útočnou a obrannou tématickou), jejich vnitřní a venkovní stavbu, co se týče slov a vět, a, v poslední řadě, dokázat, zda jsou metafory mezikulturní.

Výzkum dokázal, že převažují metafory s útočnou tématickou, což je výsledek podle očekávání právě kvůli podobnostem obchodního prostředí a válčení. Zadruhé, byly představeny nějaké terminologické názvy, i když všechny poukazují na stejnou problematiku. Obecně se může tvrdit, že v rámci vnitřní struktury metafor, výrazy s vojenskou tematikou patří do jedné kategorie (sekundární slova, zdroj, kostra) a slova, na která se vojenská charakteristika vztahuje, se řadí do druhé skupiny (primární slova, cíl, zaměření). V poslední řadě se podal důkaz o tom, že jsou tyto metafory mezikulturního charakteru, i když musí mít mluvčí na paměti možné významové rozdíly způsobené rozdílnými kulturami.

Na konci práce je přiložen dodatek obsahující seznam vybraných metafor vždy s jednou větou, aby se dokázalo, že se vojenské výrazy používají i v obchodním prostředí.