



POSUDEK VEDOUCÍHO BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk a literatura (dvouoborové studium)**

Název práce: **The Interaction of Metaphor and Metonymy in the English Names of Mushrooms**

Autorka práce: **Kateřina Burešová**

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Petr Kos, Ph.D.**

Stručná charakteristika práce

The work deals with the use of metaphor and metonymy in the names of mushrooms in English. The author categorizes the names according to the source domains and bases of metaphor and metonymy and then deals with the key issue of this work, which is the interaction of these two processes. This analysis is accompanied by a theoretical introduction to the approaches that deal with MM.

Celkové zhodnocení

The theoretical part is, in my opinion, a well-elaborated summary of approaches to MM; it is succinct and highlights the most important issues. In the practical part, however, the author works with the terms "source domain", "base", etc., which, in the theoretical part, she fails to clearly define. Also the misspelled names of Gilles Fauconnier (Gilles Feauconnier in the text, p. 11) and Mark Turner (Mark Tournier in the text, p. 11, and Mark Tournier in References, p. 37) spoil the quality of the text.

In the discussion on the names dismissed from the analysis, the author includes the chapter Calque (p. 12), in which not a single example is a real instance of calque, i.e. a name that is directly translated from a different language. The examples *agaric*, *bolete*, *polypore*, *ergot*, and *lorchel* are apparently loans, and *toadstool* is apparently an instance of folk etymology. I agree that such names need to be dismissed from the analysis, as they lack their primary motivation, but their inclusion in this chapter is not very fortunate. It is also a pity that the author did not include a complete list of the dismissed and analysed names, as it would allow for a higher credibility of the results.

In the discussion on the source domains and bases of metaphor and metonymy, the author compares individual subparts with the results of a similar work done by Iveta Doskočilová on the semantic shift in plants. However, this comparison is not sufficiently justified, nor is there sufficient critical evaluation of the comparison, i.e. what the results tell us about the nature of MM in both kingdoms.

The main drawback of the analytical part is the non-specified question of whether the interaction of metaphor and metonymy, which is the primary theme of the thesis as the title suggests, occurs in compound names only or all names. The author seems to analyse this interaction in compounds only, as the structure of the chapter implies, but, at the same time, we come across the analysis of *The Miller*, which is the only non-



compound name mentioned. Is *The Miller* the only non-compound name in the analysed corpus that includes the interaction of MM?

Also connected with the question of what exactly is analysed is another question of whether all compounds should be analysed on the basis of their constituents, i.e. individually as a composition of a modifier and a head. Cases like *Dead Man's Fingers* do not seem to be a composition of individual metaphors (the example appears in the chapter "Metaphor-based Modifier and Metaphor-based Head"), but rather an overall metaphorical expression based on a number of correspondences between the two input spaces (the shape of the mushroom, its greyish deadly colour, the light nail-like tips, etc.). Such cases could be satisfactorily described by the blending diagrams (Fauconnier and Turner, Benczes) when one metaphor is "triggered" by a number of corresponding elements between the two input spaces.

In general, the use of such diagrams would be beneficial in most cases as it would highlight the multidimensionality of the corresponding elements that are behind these conceptual processes, e.g. the metaphor on the mealy smell in *The Miller* seems to be also accompanied by its white colour.

My last comment aims at the accuracy of the analyses. The inclusion of *The Miller* under the instances of metonymy (pp. 20, 24) does not seem to be the most fortunate one as there seems to be no direct metonymic relationship between a miller or a mill and the mushroom – it is rather a metaphor on its smell (and colour), as explained at p.31. Also *Beech Rooter* is analysed as metaphoric, "a large part of its stem is hidden underground which resembles plant roots" (p. 15), but the more feasible explanation for the name seems to be given in "saprobic on roots of decaying hardwoods" (<http://www.geochembio.com/guides/fungi/Hymenopellis-furfuracea.html>), i.e. a case of metonymy, as the fungus grows on roots of the beech (and other hardwoods, which is actually a case of another metonymy A MEMBER OF A CATEGORY FOR CATEGORY).

The work meets the basic requirements placed upon a bachelor thesis and brings some interesting points, but from the overall perspective it failed to make use of all the potential that the theme offered.

Areas for discussion

Is there an interaction of metaphor and metonymy in non-compound names, too?

How would you define the term "base", which you use in the discussion on "bases of metaphor" and "bases of metonymy"?

How would you understand the claim by Antonio Barcelona that every metaphor is primarily of a metonymic nature? Apply your explanation on the names of mushrooms.

Práci **doporučuji** k obhajobě.

Navrhovaná klasifikace: **dobře**

26.8.2016

Datum

Podpis