

WORK IN PROGRESS

KATARZYNA LACH MIRGHANI¹

DOI: 10.15290/CR.2020.31.4.06

University of Białystok

ORCID: 0000-0002-3651-0825

Selected aspects of the conceptualisation of *success* in English and Polish

Abstract. Conceptualisation is “the process of meaning construction to which language contributes. It does so by providing access to rich encyclopaedic knowledge and by prompting for complex processes of conceptual integration” (Evans 2007: 38). Concrete, non-abstract entities are easy to grasp and to conceptualise with the use of the senses. A problem occurs when the mind has to form an idea about abstract concepts that cannot be seen, heard, smelled, or tasted. Linguists (Evans & Green 2006; Gibbs 1999; Kövecses 2010; Lakoff 1986; Lakoff & Johnson 2003) proved that people share a tendency to create conceptual analogies between abstract concepts and concrete entities by mapping the properties of the latter upon the former. It has been proved (Trojszczak 2016, 2017) that people share conceptualisations between languages. The primary goal of this comparative study was to examine the conceptualisation of success in two languages, English and Polish, in order to identify differences and similarities. The results of the study proved that people share the conceptualisation of the analysed target domain in both languages, which means they understand success in the same terms. There is a difference in the intensity, however; some metaphors are more widely used in one language and some in the other. There is also a difference in the linguistic expressions that constitute the conceptualisations.

Keywords: conceptualisation, metaphor, mapping, source domain, target domain, success.

1. Introduction

At the beginning of the 18th century, researchers acknowledged metaphors as a cognitive tool, but a tendency to marginalise the role of metaphors in communication

¹ Address for correspondence: Department of Linguistics, University of Białystok, pl. NZS 1, 15-420 Białystok, Poland. E-mail: lach.katarzyna@gmail.com

was widespread. In the 20th century, metaphors became the subject of numerous studies (Gibbs 1999; Lakoff & Johnson 1980/2003; McGlone 2007; Reddy 1979), and they have been proved to enable us to comprehend and verbalise abstract concepts. We use them unconsciously (Lakoff 1987: 296), and we share the conceptualisations of these abstract concepts within a particular language, which makes effective communication possible. What is more, some conceptualisations are shared between languages and cultures (Trojszczak 2016, 2017), which leads to the conclusion that there may be a universal way of thinking about particular concepts. The aim of this study is to compare English and Polish conceptualisations of SUCCESS in order to find out whether the two distinct cultures share a way of conceptualising this abstract concept. It may also be a starting point for research on the influence of certain conceptualisations on people's attitudes towards achieving success.

2. Literature review

2.1. The concept of SUCCESS

The concept of SUCCESS has usually been approached from a practical perspective (Cottrell 2003; Gunz & Heslin 2005; Hall 2005; Heslin 2005) as a goal that may be achieved by a variety of means. A study by Łacka-Badura (2016) focused on linguistic manifestations of SUCCESS metaphors in American success guidebooks, aphorisms, and quotes. Cross-linguistic research was conducted by Ajimer (2004), who compared ways of talking about ability and success in English and Swedish; the locus of this research was in grammar and modality, however. This study will look at the concept of SUCCESS from a cognitive linguistic point of view. Cross-linguistic research will be used to compare conceptualisations in two languages.

2.2. Literal versus figurative meanings

There have been many attempts to draw a distinction between the *literal* and the *figurative* use of language (Evans & Green 2006: 287-289; Rumelhart 1993: 71-82; Searle 1979: 117-136). All of them came to the conclusion that the distinction is never straightforward. What we think of as literal depends on a variety of factors, including the culture, context, and aim of the utterance. Therefore, we must assume that it is impossible to consider an utterance as 100% literal or figurative; it is always a matter of degree. In order to analyse metaphors, some assumptions about the literality of a phrase must be made because they serve as a foundation for a figurative language interpretation. For the purpose of this paper, a phrase will be considered figurative or metaphorical if it has a more basic, contemporary meaning in the *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* (Rundell & Fox 2002) and the Metaphor Identification Procedure (henceforth, MIP) by the Pragglejaz Group (2007), which will be described further later in this paper.

2.3. Metaphor

The term *metaphor* stems from the Greek *metaphora*, which derives from *meta* ‘across’ and ‘beyond’ and *phora* ‘to carry’ or ‘to bear’. The etymological sense is ‘to transfer from one thing to another’ (Deutscher 2005: 117). Aristotle considered metaphor a sign of language proficiency and mastery and claimed that “metaphor requires a special talent or genius and should be alien to most ordinary speakers” (Gibbs 1999: 121). On the other hand, he considered it an embellishment or a deviation from language clarity. In the late 17th century and early 18th century, Giambattista Vico claimed that human beings could apprehend the world with the use of the senses and metaphors; this became a means of describing concepts difficult to capture. At the end of the 19th century, the French philologist Michel Bréal, in his *Essai de Semantique*, argued that metaphor was not just a discourse decoration but that it was a ubiquitous and principal device of semantic change. Later on in the 20th century, linguists changed their perspectives and began to view metaphor as a communicative tool (Gibbs 1999: 199; Lakoff & Johnson 1980/2003: 4-5; McGlone 2007: 110; Reddy 1979: 306-308). Michael Reddy (1979) was one of the first researchers to provide us with a detailed linguistic analysis of metaphors, which he believed were not a linguistic phenomenon but rather a cognitive phenomenon. In his paper, he analysed the metaphors of *language* in English and found that people share a tendency to understand LANGUAGE in terms of a CONDUIT that conveys ideas. He described the following complex metaphors: IDEAS ARE OBJECTS, LINGUISTIC EXPRESSIONS ARE CONTAINERS, and COMMUNICATION IS SENDING. As a result, he proved that metaphors do not belong solely to the realm of poetry and are widely used in everyday language (Reddy 1979: 284-324). What is more, in a study that examined psychotherapeutic interviews, essays, and political debates, Pollio et al. (1977) counted the frequency of “frozen” metaphors (existing in language) and those created spontaneously (“novel” metaphors). The research revealed that people used 1.8 novel and 4.08 frozen metaphors per minute of discourse. With the assumption that people engage in conversation for as little as 2 hours a day, a person would utter 4.7 million novel and 21.4 million frozen metaphors over a 60-year lifespan (Pollio et al. 1977; Gibbs 1999: 123). This indicates that metaphors are commonly used and are neither exotic nor literary forms of language.

2.4. Conceptual metaphor theory

Michael Reddy’s (1979) conduit metaphor proved that the locus of metaphors is in thought, not in language, but the researchers started to analyse the key aspects of conceptualisation after the publication of the first edition of the influential book *Metaphors We Live By* by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson in 1980. Many researchers soon addressed this issue, as well (Gibbs 1999; Kövesces 2003/2010; Lakoff 1986, 1987; Lakoff & Johnson 1980/2003). Lakoff (1987: 296) emphasised that our conceptual systems are unconsciously organised into categories and most of our thinking involves these categories. The researchers

observed that “conceptual metaphors are *unidirectional*” (Evans & Green 2006: 296). Although we conceptualise ARGUMENT in terms of WAR, we cannot conceptualise WAR in terms of ARGUMENT. Lakoff and Turner (1989: 131-133) also observed that even if there are two domains that can be conceptualised interchangeably, the conceptualisations have different mappings and therefore they are different metaphors.

(1)

PEOPLE ARE MACHINES

- a. *He works like a robot.*
- b. *She’s had a nervous breakdown.*

MACHINES ARE PEOPLE

- c. *Why does my computer do that to me?*
- d. *Did your car want to start today?*

In (1a) and (1b) the efficiency and reliability, or lack of them, in the machines are mapped onto humans, but in (1c) and (1d) the desire and free will of people are mapped onto machines.

2.4.1. Conceptual versus linguistic metaphor

For most ordinary people a metaphor is a feature of a language. However, there is a distinction between a “linguistic” metaphor and a “conceptual” metaphor. The linguistic metaphor is a linguistic expression (Lakoff 2003: 4). It is the articulation of an unaware conceptualisation. Concepts govern our thought and our everyday functioning (Lakoff 1987: 293). “A conceptual metaphor consists of two *conceptual domains*, in which one domain is understood in terms of another. A conceptual domain is any coherent organisation of experience” (Kövecses 2010: 4). The conceptualisation is a projection (“mapping”) between a “source domain”, which is more concrete and easy to grasp, and a “target domain”, which is more abstract. The conceptual metaphor is a foundation for the linguistic metaphor. When the conceptualisation is established, language users can start expressing one domain in terms of another. The linguistic metaphors are examined in order to gain knowledge about conceptual metaphors.

2.4.2. Elements of the conceptual metaphor: conceptual domains and mapping

As cited above in the article by Kövecses, the conceptual domain is “any coherent organisation of experience”. It can be a journey, a war, a motion, feelings, a human body, buildings, or any number of other things. Two conceptual domains establish the conceptual metaphor through mapping. The mapping is a transfer of some

characteristics from one domain to another, or a set of “semantic correspondences” between two domains (Kövecses 2010: 7). The domains involved in this process are the target domain and source domain. The target domain is the domain being described. The source domain is the one we use to describe the other domain. Source domains are usually concrete. They emerge from our indirect experience (Kövecses 2010: 18-23). Target domains are the ones that we cannot grasp indirectly. They are usually more abstract (Kövecses 2010: 23-28).

As mentioned above, mapping transfers some characteristics from one domain to another, and therefore it emphasises these characteristics of the target domain. At the same time, it hides characteristics that people (unconsciously) do not want to highlight. Let us consider the example from Kövecses (2010: 91): the MIND IS A BRITTLE OBJECT metaphor:

(2)

MIND IS A BRITTLE OBJECT

- a. *Her ego is very fragile.*
- b. *You have to handle him with care since his wife’s death.*
- c. *He broke under cross-examination*
- d. *She is easily crushed.*
- e. *The experience shattered him.*
- f. *I’m going to pieces.*
- g. *His mind snapped.*
- h. *He cracked up.*

The source domain focuses on psychological strength or the lack of it, which is only one aspect of the concept of the mind. It highlights this aspect, and the other aspects remain out of focus. To observe this process, we can use examples of metaphors with the same target and different source domains provided by Kövecses (2010: 92):

(3)

- a. AN ARGUMENT IS A CONTAINER: *Your argument has **a lot of content**. What is the **core** of his argument?*
- b. AN ARGUMENT IS A JOURNEY: *We will **proceed in a step-by-step** fashion. We have **covered a lot of ground**.*
- c. AN ARGUMENT IS WAR: *He **won** the argument. I couldn’t **defend** that point.*
- d. AN ARGUMENT IS A BUILDING: *She **constructed a solid** argument. We have got a **good foundation** for the argument.*

The CONTAINER metaphor in (3a) emphasises the content and basicness of an argument; the JOURNEY metaphor (3b) highlights the progress and the content; the WAR metaphor (3c) focuses on the control over the argument or the opponent; and the BUILDING metaphor (3d) emphasises the aspects of the construction of the argument and its strength.

3. The study

Rundell and Fox (2002: 1434) define *success* as “the achievement of something that you planned or wanted to do,” and *a successful person* as somebody who “achieves a lot and becomes rich, famous, respected, etc.” One of the synonyms for *success* is *victory*, a word that adds a winning/losing connotation to the purport of the term. Having assumed that being happy, healthy, or wealthy may be the aim of every human being, I will analyse phrases that indicate the fact of fulfilling this aim even if the willingness and planning aspects are not explicitly stated.

3.1. Methodological framework

In this study, the cognitive linguistic theoretical framework (Croft & Cruse 2004; Evans & Green 2006) and corpus-based research approach (McEnery & Hardie 2012) have been combined. The conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff & Johnson 1980) has been adopted as a fundamental approach to metaphors. In order to determine the figurativeness of a phrase with the use of the MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007), the *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* (Rundell & Fox 2002) has been used; all of the definitions come from this dictionary. Polish definitions, when needed, were also taken from a corpus-based dictionary, namely, *Słownik Języka Polskiego PWN* (Drabik et al. 2018). All of the example phrases come from corpora, and the examples of phrases in Polish have been translated with the use of the Leipzig Glossing Rules (Comrie et al. 2015).

3.2. Corpora

In this research three corpora have been used: the British National Corpus (BNC), the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), and the National Corpus of Polish (NCP). The BNC and the NCP are “reference corpora”, which means that texts are no longer added to them. All the corpora are available online for researchers.

The BNC is a corpus of more than 4000 written (90%) and spoken (10%) British English samples. The number of words totals 100 million (Aston & Burnard 1998: 28). The NCP is a collection of Polish written and spoken samples (Przepiórkowski et al. 2012: 8). The COCA is a corpus of spoken and written American English that was established in 2008 by Mark Davies. It is regularly updated (Davies 2010: 447). Each year texts containing 20 million words are added; at the end of 2017, the corpus consisted of more than 570 million words (available at <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>).

To extract linguistic data online, browsers have been used. Both the NCP and the BNC have been accessed through the HASK browser created by Piotr Pezik (available at http://pelcra.pl/hask_pl/ and http://pelcra.pl/hask_en/). The NCP data have also been extracted through the official corpus browser (available at <http://nkjp.pl/poliqarp/>). The COCA has been browsed using its online interface by Brigham Young University (available at <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>), which provides the BNC corpus search engine, as well (available at <https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/>).

The expressions used in the research have been compiled with the use of the “searching for target domain vocabulary” and “searching for source domain vocabulary” strategies (Stefanowitsch 2006: 2). The former was the first step in the research, and it allowed the author to find metaphorical collocations with the word *success* and its synonyms. The latter provided the author with the set of metaphorical expressions that linguistically do not stem from the lexeme *success* or its synonyms. They are expressions with the lexical units from popular source domains such as food and motion.

The corpora were not only used as search tools; all of the example sentences for each metaphorical expression were taken from them. Because they are collections of authentic language, corpora depict the use of the metaphors realistically.

In order to determine whether a phrase is metaphorical or not the MIP of the Pragglez Group (2007) had to be used. However, because it is a method for identifying metaphors in discourse, it had to be adjusted so that it fulfilled the research needs. The procedure by the Pragglez Group is as follows:

(4)

1. Read the entire text–discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.
2. Determine the lexical units in the text–discourse.
3.
 - a. For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, 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.
 - 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.
 - 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.

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

(Pragglejaz Group 2007: 3)

As may be seen in (4), the first step was supposed to be reading the entire text, which is impossible while researching the corpora, so this step had to be omitted. The first step of the research involved gathering the phrases concerning the target domain by means of the already mentioned methods. Then, it had to be determined whether they were metaphorical or not. In order to do that, the definition of the components of the phrase had to be analysed by searching for more concrete, more precise, historically older lexical units within the phrase or for meaning as related to body action in the lexical units within the phrase. If it was possible to find a basic meaning, and the contextual meaning contrasted with this basic meaning, the lexical unit was categorised as metaphorically used. The phrases were then categorised according to mappings. The step-by-step procedure of the research is shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1. The research procedure (based on Pragglejaz Group 2007: 3)

| |
|---|
| <p>1. Search for a target domain vocabulary.</p> <p>1.1. Gather the target domain vocabulary using a dictionary.</p> <p>1.2. Search the corpora for collocations of the target domain vocabulary.</p> <p>1.3. Establish the meaning of each phrase.</p> <p>1.4. Establish the meaning of each lexical unit within the phrase to search for the meaning that is:</p> <p>1.4.1. more concrete or precise;</p> <p>1.4.2. historically older.</p> |
| <p>2. Search for a source domain vocabulary.</p> <p>2.1. Gather the source domain vocabulary using a dictionary.</p> <p>2.2. Search the corpora for collocations of the target domain vocabulary meaning by which it is connected to the source domain.</p> <p>2.3. Establish the meaning of each phrase.</p> <p>2.4. Establish the meaning of each lexical unit within the phrase to search for the meaning that is:</p> <p>2.4.1. related to bodily action;</p> <p>2.4.2. historically older.</p> |
| <p>3. Group phrases that have a metaphorical meaning according to mappings.</p> |
| <p>4. Extract the examples of the phrases from the corpora.</p> |
| <p>5. Translate and gloss Polish example phrases.</p> |

3.3. Glossing

The comparative analysis of metaphors in two languages requires the translation of phrases. Lexical units must be translated from Polish to English. In order to fully represent metaphorical expressions, some units had to be translated lexeme by lexeme or morpheme by morpheme. The glossing rules developed by the researchers of the Department of Linguistics of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology and of the Department of Linguistics of the University of Leipzig were used. They may be accessed at <https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/Glossing-Rules.pdf> (Comrie et al. 2015). In order to translate lexemes properly, there was a need to use grammatical labels, a list of which may be reviewed in the APPENDIX.

4. Results

4.1. Metaphors of success

4.1.1. *Being successful is being high up*

One of the most widespread conceptualisations of the analysed target domain is SUCCESS IS UP. There are many examples of this metaphor in both English and Polish. They are in agreement with the orientational, generic metaphor MORE IS UP. It manifests in English phrases such as *upwardly mobile*, *to come up in the world*, *to be at the top of the heap*, *to do something with flying colours*, *to be flying high*, and *to reach/to be at one's peak*. *Upwardly mobile* (5a) is an adjective that describes a person who “moves into a higher social class by becoming richer and more successful” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 1582). *To come up in the world* (5b) means “to become richer, more powerful or more successful than before” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 272). *To be at the top of the heap* (5c), according to Rundell and Fox (2002: 1582), means to be “in the highest position in a society or organisation.” In this particular definition, we can also see *the highest position*, which is in agreement with the SUCCESS IS UP metaphor. We can also do something (especially, pass an examination) with *flying colours* (5d), which means “very successfully” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 543), and we can be *flying high* (5e), which means to be “very successful” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 542). The word *peak* in the phrases *to reach one's peak* and *to be at one's peak* (5f) is “a time when someone or something is most successful or powerful” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 1044). *To rise* can also mean “to achieve success or power” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 1226), as in the phrase *rise to the top* (5g).

(5)

- a. *The children of many working-class parents have been **upwardly mobile** socially.*
- b. *Kaz had **come up in the world** from the lowest ranks to the highest.*
- c. *... from Aerosmith, which was **at the top of the heap** around the middle of the decade, to Deep Purple, Black Sabbath, and Grand Funk Railroad.*

- d. ... she passed with **flying colours**.
- e. Engineers ... have been **flying high** recently.
- f. Mr. Wise ... felt that he had **reached his peak** at Reuters in 1987.
- g. Testosterone can help explain which men **rise to the top**.

There are similar metaphors in Polish, such as *piąć się w górę*, *górować nad kimś*, *przewyższać kogoś*, *osiągnąć szczyt*, *być na szczycie*, *wznieść się na wyżyny*, and *być ponad innymi*. The basic meaning of *piąć się w górę* is to ‘climb up’, but its metaphorical meaning is to ‘become more successful’ (6). It is worth noting that in Polish, the preposition *w górę*, which means ‘up’, is a metaphor itself, because its glossing is *up the.mountain*; example (6).

(6)

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|----------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| <i>Zaczął</i> | <i>piąć.się</i> | <i>w</i> | <i>górze</i> , | <i>jako</i> | <i>jego</i> | <i>kochanek</i> . |
| start-2-M-PAST | climb-REFL | up | the.mountain | as | his | lover |

As his lover, he started to become more and more successful.

The verb *piąć się*, or its perfective aspect *wspiąć się*, also collocates with a *corporate* or *social ladder*, as in example (7):

(7)

| | | | |
|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <i>Mieli</i> | <i>nadzieję</i> | <i>szybko</i> | <i>wspiąć.się</i> |
| have-PL-PAST | hope-N | fast | climb.up-PRT-REFL |
| <i>po</i> | <i>drabinie</i> | <i>społecznej</i> | |
| on | the ladder | social | |

They hoped to climb up the social ladder fast.

The next two phrases (8a) and (8b), *górować nad kimś* and *przewyższać kogoś*, literally mean “to be taller or higher” or “to be in a higher physical spot” than somebody else, but they also mean “to be successful and superior to somebody else” or “to have an advantage over somebody (usually the enemy, the opponent)” (Drabik et al. 2018: 241, 784).

(8)

| | | | | | | |
|------------------|----------|---------------|-------------|----------------|------------|---------------|
| a. <i>Jestem</i> | <i>w</i> | <i>stanie</i> | <i>znów</i> | <i>górować</i> | <i>nad</i> | <i>innymi</i> |
| be-1-PRS | in | a.state | again | mountain-V-INF | over | the.others |

I’m able to outdo the others again.

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|---------------------|
| b. <i>nie</i> | <i>tylko</i> | <i>dorównał</i> | <i>Horacemu</i> , | <i>lecz</i> | <i>nawet</i> | <i>go</i> | <i>przewyższył</i> |
| not | only | equal-V-2-PAST | Horacy | but | even | him | over. high-V-2-PAST |

Not only did he equal Horacy, he even outdid him.

The primary, literal meaning of the phrase *być na szczycie* is ‘to be on the peak’. The metaphorical meaning is ‘to be successful’ or ‘to be on the top’ (9), which is analogous to the phrase in (5g).

(9)

| | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|------------------|
| <i>Wyniesiony</i> | <i>oklaskami</i> | <i>na</i> | <i>niejaką</i> | <i>wysokość,</i> |
| rise-3-M-PRT | by.applause | to | some | heights |
| <i>uwierzył</i> | <i>że</i> | <i>jest</i> | <i>na</i> | <i>szczycie</i> |
| believe-3-M-PAST | that | be-1-M-PRS | on | the.peak |

Risen to the heights by the applause, he believed to be on top.

In the example above there is also the novel metaphor *to raise someone* (by applause) *to the heights*, a phrase that is not commonly used in Polish; it is in agreement with the BEING SUCCESSFUL IS BEING HIGH UP metaphor; a successful performer gets much applause that can be a measure of his/her success. What is more, *the society* and *the career* can be collocated with the word *ladder*, as in *social ladder* or *career ladder* (in Polish, *drabina społeczna* or *szczeble kariery*); the higher on the ladder people climb, the more successful they are. There is also a phrase *stanąć na wysokości zadania*, which can be translated into English as ‘to fulfil the task successfully’ and can be used as in example (10).

(10)

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------|-----------------|------------------|-----------|------------------|----------------|
| <i>Jonathan Davis</i> | <i>z</i> | <i>kolegami</i> | <i>stanęli</i> | <i>na</i> | <i>wysokości</i> | <i>zadania</i> |
| Jonathan Davis | with | friends | stand-3-PL-M-PRT | on | the.height | of.the.task |

Jonathan Davis and his friends fulfilled the task...

4.1.2. *Being successful is moving forward*

Being successful is also conceptualised as moving forward. Both in English and Polish, if you are ahead of the rest, you are more successful. These metaphors may have derived from sports and racing, fields in which the fastest person gets ahead of the competitors, wins, is successful. The phrase *to get ahead* (11a) means “to be more successful than other people” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 594). The phrase *to be ahead of the pack* (11b) has a similar meaning; *the pack* can be “main group of people following behind the leader in a race or competition” or “a group of people who do something together” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 1019). *To lead the way* (11c) is similar and means “to be the first to do something, especially to achieve success” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 807). There are also Polish phrases such as *wyprzedzać kogoś* (12a) and *przodować* (12b) that mean the same as the English expressions “to get ahead of somebody” or “to be ahead”.

(11)

- a. *We were go-getters and we wanted to **get ahead**.*
- b. *Hewlett-Packard Company is well **ahead of the pack** in fitting out its Unix machines...*
- c. *To see Butler **lead the way** in Sunday' 2-0 win against the haughty Giants...*

(12)

- a. *Europa wyprzedzała resztę świata.*
 Europe get.ahead-3-F-PROG-PAST the.rest of.the.world
 Europe was getting ahead of the rest of the world.
- b. *Za wszelką cenę chciał przodować we wszystkim.*
 For all cost want-3-M-PAST be.ahead in everything.
 He wanted to be ahead in everything at all costs.

The next three verbs that have a metaphorical meaning of wanting to succeed are *to coast* (13a), which means, according to the dictionary, “to achieve success very easily” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 260); *to cruise* (13b), which means “to achieve success early in a race, game, or competition” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 335); and *to storm* (13c), which can mean “to quickly become very successful” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 1414).

(13)

- a. *Lisa Low **coasted** to victory.*
- b. *They **cruised into** a three-goal lead.*
- c. *... by the skilful Portuguese, who scored three goals in eight minutes and then **stormed on** to victory.*

To “talk about progress or success” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 504), we can use the phrase *to get far* (14a) or *to go far* (14b). In Polish, the equivalent phrase is *zajść daleko*; example (15).

(14)

- a. *He won't **get far** with those infinitive verbs he uses at the moment.*
- b. *I never **went far** with languages before...*

(15)

- Joakim może w koszykówce zajść daleko.*
 Joakim can-3-PRES in basketball go far
 Joakim can get far in basketball.

4.1.3. *Being successful is swimming*

Another conceptualisation is that BEING SUCCESSFUL IS SWIMMING. It is used in both English and in Polish, but there are more diverse linguistic expressions in the former. This may be due to the fact that England is an island country with a maritime culture.

Being on the crest of the wave (16a) means “enjoying a period of great success” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 329); the Polish equivalent of the phrase is *być na fali* (16b).

(16)

a. *They're selling the work of artists who are on the crest of the wave in the market.*

b. Zespół zaczął być na fali, wygrał kilka
ważnych spotkań.

The.team start-3-M-PRT be-inf on the.wave win-3-M-PAST. a.few
important meetings

The team won a few important matches and started riding the crest of the wave.

The idiom *sink or swim* (17a) means “to be left on your own to succeed or fail” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 1334). The phrase *to swim* means “to succeed” and the phrase *to sink* means “to fail”. If something is done *swimmingly* (17b), it is done “in an extremely satisfactory or successful way” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 1453). Another adjective is *buoyant* (17c). According to Rundell and Fox, “if the economy [or business] is *buoyant*, it is successful and seems likely to remain successful” (2002: 180).

(17)

a. *It was sink or swim for Noreen O'Neil.*

b. *Obviously, if a business is going really swimmingly, then it may be easier to...*

c. *While the business was buoyant, there was a living in it for many small shops...*

4.1.4. *Success is food/beverage*

Another conceptualisation is that SUCCESS IS FOOD/BEVERAGE. It is heard in both languages. You can be *hungry for success* (18a) (in Polish, *głodny sukcesu*) (19a) or *spragniony sukcesu* (19b) (‘thirsty for success’). You can enjoy *the sweet smell of success/victory* (18b). The Polish equivalent, *słodki zapach zwycięstwa* (19c), may be a borrowing from English because there is only one hit in the corpus and no mention in the PWN dictionary (Drabik et al. 2018). There can also be *a recipe for success* (18), or *przepis na sukces* (19d) in Polish. There is also the Polish phrase *upojony sukcesem* (19e), which means ‘drunk with success’.

(18)

a. *I am hungry for success again.*

b. *Celebrate the sweet smell of success at a shrimper's family feast.*

c. *We found a recipe for success...*

(19)

- a. *Wciąż jestem bardzo, bardzo głodny sukcesu.*
 Still be-1-PRES very very hungry for.success
 I'm still very, very hungry for success.
- b. *Jak nikt byłem spragniony sukcesu, chciałem medalu.*
 Like nobody be-1-PAST thirsty for.success want-1-PAST a medal
 I was hungry for success like nobody else, and I wanted a medal.
- c. *Dobrze jest czuć słodki zapach zwycięstwa.*
 Good be-3-PRES smell-V-INF sweet smell-N of.the.victory
 It's good to enjoy the sweet smell of success.
- d. *Dobry pomysł czyli przepis na sukces*
 Good idea so a.recipe for success
 'A good idea'; in other words, a recipe for success.
- e. *Upojony sukcesem wyborczym i medialnym*
 Drunk with.success electoral and media-ADJ
Gerhard Schröder zapowiadał zmniejszenie liczby bezrobotnych.
 Gerhard Schröder announce-3-M-PRT the.decrease number of.unemployed
 Gerhard Schröder, buoyed up with the media and electoral success, announced
 a decrease in the unemployment.

4.1.5. *Success is fruit and work is a plant*

In the metaphor SUCCESS IS FRUIT, our WORK IS A PLANT that can *bear fruit* (20a), or in Polish, *przynosić owoce* (21c). You can enjoy the *fruit of your labour* (20b), or in Polish, *zbierać plony* (21a) or *owoce ciężkiej pracy* (21b). The metaphorical meaning of the phrase *to bear fruit* (20a) is “to have a successful result” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 571). The Polish equivalent is *przynosić owoce* (21c) or *przynosić plony* (21d). *Przynosić* means in Polish ‘to carry something to a place’ but also ‘to be the cause for something’. After the work bears fruit, you can *zbierać plony* (21a), which means ‘to harvest’.

(20)

- a. *The Chancellor's policies are not expected to **bear fruit** until the spring.*
 b. *The Canal Treaties he signed with Jimmy Carter were **the fruit of his long labours**.*

(21)

a. *W tej chwili dopiero zaczynam powoli*
 At this moment just start-1-PRES slowly
zbierać plony swej działalności.
 collect the.crop-PL my activity
 I'm just starting to take the fruit of my labour.

b. *Zbieramy owoce ciężkiej pracy – wyjaśnić*
coach Byron Scott.
 Collect-3-PL-PRES the.fruit of.hard of.work – explain-3-M-PAST
 coach Byron Scott
 We collect the fruit of our labour explained coach Byron Scott.

c. *...ich walka zaczęła przynosić owoce.*
 ...their struggle-N start-3 bear-INF fruit
 ...their struggle started to bear fruit.

d. *Upór i skoncentrowane działanie zaczęły*
przynosić plony.
 Stubbornness and concentrated work start.to-3-F-PL-PRT
 bear crops
 Stubbornness and concentrated work started to bear fruit.

4.1.6. *Success is a flower and an enterprise is a plant*

In the metaphor SUCCESS IS A FLOWER AND AN ENTERPRISE IS A PLANT, if an enterprise is successful, it *blossoms*, *blooms*, or *flowers*. In Polish, there is an adjective, *kwitnący*, which means 'blossoming'. *To bloom* (22a) means 'to develop successfully' (Rundell & Fox 2002: 137); *to blossom* (22b) means 'to develop and become more successful' (Rundell & Fox 2002: 137); and *to flower* (22c) means 'to become more successful and completely developed' (Rundell & Fox 2002: 540). In Polish, if a business is *kwitnący* (23) ('blossoming'), it means it is very successful.

(22)

- a. *Relationships have been **blooming** since the show first began.*
- b. *...summer of 1967 that birthed activists, artists, and a **blossoming** hippie movement.*
- c. *What these two towns shared was an intellectual **flowering** in improbable places.*

(23)

Kwitnący biznes metalowy.

Blossoming business metal-ADJ

The blossoming metal business.

4.1.7. Success is a (locked) building

The metaphor SUCCESS IS A BUILDING or A LOCKED BUILDING implies that you can acquire the key to get into the room and gain success. *The key to success* (24), or *klucz do sukcesu* (25) in Polish, is the most critical factor in achieving success.

(24)

The real key to success is tailoring the system to fit the end users.

(25)

Dobry pomysł to w Supraślu klucz do sukcesu.

A.good idea it in Supraśl the.key to success

A good idea is the key to success in Supraśl.

In both languages, success can also be conceptualised as a building per se. The phrase *murowany sukces* means it is sure the success will be achieved. The literal meaning of *murowany* (26) is ‘made of bricks’, but metaphorically it can mean ‘absolutely certain’. In English, we can *build success* on a *foundation* (27a) and (27b).

(26)

Ty i ja — murowany sukces.

You and me — made.of.bricks-ADJ success.

You and me — a certain success.

(27)

a. To **build success**, parents and mentors should help children develop their natural talents.

b. Preschool can provide children with a solid and lasting **foundation for success** later in life.

4.1.8. Being successful is being big

There are a large number of metaphorical expressions that describe a successful person in terms of the metaphor BEING SUCCESSFUL IS BEING BIG. “A person that is important, powerful, and successful” can be called *a big cheese* (28a), *a big gun* (28b), *a big beast* (28c), or *a big boy* (28d) (Rundell & Fox 2002: 123). The phrase *to make something big* (28e) means “to make something successful” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 122). In Polish, the nouns

sztycha (29a) (literally, ‘a big cone’) and *gruba ryba* (29b) (literally, ‘a fat fish’) can mean ‘an important, powerful and successful person’.

(28)

...remember Chris Licht; he used to be **the big cheese** over here.

What’s **a big gun** like Burt Becker doing in a burg like this?

The last of the “**big beasts**”, Kenneth Clarke, has finally been shuffled off the stage.

But ultimately, General Kelly is **a big boy**.

Legent Corp is aiming to **make it big** in systems management.

(29)

a. *Bo pani była sztycha.*

Because you-F-FR be-3-F-PAST a.big.cone

Because you were very important and successful.

b. ...*gruba ryba. w światowym showbiznesie.*

... a.fat fish in global show.business

... a very important and successful person in global show business.

4.1.9. Success is a container

If success is *full* (30), it means the aim of the person striving for success has been fulfilled completely. In this case, the metaphor is SUCCESS IS A CONTAINER. It also functions in Polish; success can be *pełny* (31).

(30)

Whilst this requires considerable political and structural change to achieve full success.

(31)

Trudno osiągnąć pełny sukces.

Hard-ADV achieve-INF full success

It’s hard to achieve full success.

4.1.10. Success is a loud thing

The adjective *resounding* (32a) can be “used for emphasis on how successful someone or something is” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 1206). Something can also be *a roaring success* (32b), which means it is “very successful” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 1229). To do something *with a bang* (32) means to do it “in a very exciting or successful way” (Rundell & Fox 2002: 95). In Polish, success can be *głośny* (33).

(32)

- a. ...it was all such **a resounding success** so I was regaled with all the details...
- b. The final week of Hamlet was **a roaring success**.
- c. It'll go up **with a bang** I think!

(33)

| | | | | |
|------------------|-----|-----------|--------|---------|
| ...przyniosta | mu | pierwszy | głośny | sukces. |
| ...bring-3-F-PRT | him | the first | loud | success |

She brought him the first resounding success.

5. Conclusions

The above analysis shows that *success*, understood as achieving something that was intended, is conceptualised in both languages in a similar way. The reason that the metaphors in both languages are comparable may be that people share some perception schemas. In all conceptual metaphors that have been analysed, *success* is understood in terms of physical entities, such as a fruit, flower, or building, and actions and states, such as being in a specific place or performing an action. The properties of *success* are identified in terms of these entities, and this makes the abstract concept easier to understand. The metaphors BEING SUCCESSFUL IS BEING HIGH UP and BEING SUCCESSFUL IS MOVING FORWARD rely upon our orientation in space and are connected with a cultural experience. Polish speakers, as well as English speakers, share the conceptualisation of a positive evaluation in association with the upward or forward orientation. The BEING SUCCESSFUL IS BEING HIGH UP metaphor in English was more often associated with flying, whereas in Polish, the majority of metaphors were connected to mountains and highlands. The metaphor BEING SUCCESSFUL IS MOVING FORWARD stems from the fields of sports and racing, in which the faster one moves forward the more successful the person is. BEING SUCCESSFUL conceptualised as SWIMMING stems from the maritime culture of England; it may be that because Poland is a landlocked nation, there are not many linguistic examples for this conceptualisation in Polish. In the metaphors SUCCESS IS FOOD/BEVERAGE, SUCCESS IS FRUIT AND WORK IS A PLANT, and SUCCESS IS A FLOWER AND AN ENTERPRISE IS A PLANT, a nonphysical, abstract entity gains physical features; it can grow, bloom, and be eaten or drunk by a human. If it is achieved to the fullest extent, *success* can also be conceptualised as A CONTAINER: it is *full*. This conceptualisation highlights the state of completeness but does not map all the states between being full and empty. If the achievement does not work out as planned, we do not say that it is *half empty* or *half full*. In European culture, a successful person is set as an example for others and is often admired. In the metaphors BEING SUCCESSFUL IS BEING BIG and SUCCESS IS A LOUD THING, a successful person can be

easily distinguished among others because of his or her metaphorical size or loudness. *Success* is also something that everyone desires, but it is not easily achieved. This difficulty is emphasised in the SUCCESS IS A LOCKED BUILDING metaphor. The metaphorical *key to success* is an essential factor in achieving what one wants.

The study of two Indo-European languages of two distinct families seems to prove that people may, to some extent, share conceptual systems and verbalise these conceptualisations similarly, but the proof needs further research. It also indicates that the same conceptualisations may be found in other languages. It would be worth researching what similarities and differences occur between more distant languages.

Further research may focus on the relationship between a conceptualisation and the attitude toward the concepts to see whether there is dependency between the prevalent use of certain metaphors and conscious and unconscious behaviours.

APPENDIX

| Label | Meaning |
|-------|-----------------------------|
| N | noun |
| V | verb |
| 1 | first person |
| 2 | second person |
| 3 | third person |
| F | feminine |
| M | masculine |
| INF | infinitive |
| PRS | present tense |
| PAST | past tense |
| PRT | preterite (perfective-past) |
| REFL | reflexive |
| PROG | progressive |
| PL | plural |
| SIN | singular |
| ADV | adverb |
| FR | honorific |

References

- Aijmer, K. 2004. The semantic path from modality to aspect. In: H. Lindquist & C. Mair (eds.), *Corpus Approaches to Grammaticalization in English*, 57-78. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Aston, G. & Burnard, L. 1998. *The BNC Handbook. Exploring the British National Corpus with SARA*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Comrie, B., Haspelmath, M. & Bickel, B. 2015 (May 31). *The Leipzig Glossing Rules*. Retrieved from <https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/Glossing-Rules.pdf> (21 March 2019)
- Croft, W. & Cruse, D. A. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cottrell, S. 2003. *Skills for Success. Personal Development and Employability*. London: Pelgrave Macmillan.
- Davies, M. 2010. The Corpus of Contemporary American English as the first reliable monitor corpus of English. *Literacy and Linguistic Computing* 25(4): 447-465.
- Deutscher, G. 2005. *The Unfolding of Language: An Evolutionary Tour of Mankind's Greatest Invention*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Drabik, L., Kubiak-Sokół, A., Sobol, E. & Wiśniakowska, L. 2018. *Słownik Języka Polskiego PWN*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Evans, V. & Green, M. 2006. *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Evans, V. 2007. *A Glossary of Cognitive Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gibbs, R. W. 1999. *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gunz, H. P. & Heslin, P. A. 2005. Reconceptualizing career success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 26: 105-111.
- Heslin, P. A. 2005. Conceptualizing and evaluating career success. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 26: 113-136.
- Hall, D. T. 2005. Psychological success: When the career is a calling. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 26: 155-176.
- Kövecses, Z. 2010. *Metaphor. A Practical Introduction*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, G. 1986. The meanings of literal. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity Journal* 1(4): 291-296.
- Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women Fire and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. 2003. *Metaphors We Live By*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (1st ed. 1980).
- Lakoff, G. & Turner, M. 1989. *More than Cool Reason: a Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Łącka-Badura, J. 2016. Metaphorical conceptualization of success in American success books, aphorisms and quotes. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 58: 39-54.

- McEnery, T. & Hardie, A. 2012. *Corpus Linguistics. Method, Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McGlone, M. S. 2007. What is the explanatory value of a conceptual metaphor? *Language & Communication* 27: 109-126.
- Pollio, H. R., Barlow, J. M., Fine, H. J. & Pollio, M. R. 1977. *Psychology and the Poetics of Growth: Figurative Language in Psychology, Psychotherapy, and Education*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Pragglejaz Group. 2007. MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol* 22(1): 1-39.
- Przepiórkowski, A., Bańko, M., Górski, R. L. & Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (eds.), 2012. *Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Reddy, M. 1993. The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In: A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd. ed., 164-201. New York: Cambridge University Press (1st ed. 1979).
- Rumelhart, D. E. 1993. Problems with literal meanings. In: A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., 71-81. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rundell, M. & Fox, G. (eds.). 2002. *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- Searle, J. R. 1979. *Expression and Meaning. Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stefanowitsch, A. 2006. Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy". In: A. Stefanowitsch & S. Th. (eds.), *Corpus-based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy*, 1-17. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Trojszczak, M. 2016. Selected aspects of conceptualization of 'insight' in English and Polish. In: I. Czwenar, D. Gonigroszek & A. Stanecka (eds.), *Foreign Languages and Cultures: Contemporary Contexts*, 57-68. Piotrków Trybunalski: Naukowe Wydawnictwo Potrzkowskie.
- Trojszczak, M. 2017. 'Problem solving' in English and Polish – a cognitive study of selected metaphorical conceptualizations. In: J. T. Waliński & P. Peżik (eds.), *Language, Corpora, and Cognition*, 200-219. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Katarzyna Lach Mirghani is a Master's student of Linguistics at the University of Białystok, Poland. Her research interests include cognitive linguistics and computational linguistics. Her current research focuses on conceptual metaphors.