

UDC 81-119

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2522-4077-2024-210-4>

MILITARY METAPHOR AS A CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR

ВІЙСЬКОВА МЕТАФОРА ЯК КОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНА МЕТАФОРА

Pasternak T.A.,

orcid.org/0000-0003-0589-6881

Scopus Author ID: 57221644357

Associate Professor, Candidate of Science in Philology,

Associate Professor at the Department of Romano-Germanic Languages,

National Academy of Security Service of Ukraine

The article explores the use of military metaphors in language and discourse, focusing on how these metaphors enhance text strength and emotional impact. The author discusses the prevalence of military metaphors in various contexts, such as economics, politics, and media, and analyzes the positive and negative effects of using such metaphors. She draws on the work of both foreign and Ukrainian scholars in metaphor theory to provide a comprehensive understanding of military metaphors in modern English-language media discourse.

The article begins by defining metaphor as a form of hidden comparison that helps identify special features of subjects. It discusses different classifications of metaphors based on prevalence, structure, and function, highlighting the complexity and ambiguity of metaphorical concepts. The author presents various types of metaphors identified by different scholars, such as dead metaphors, cliché-metaphors, lexical metaphors, and author's metaphors.

The author then delves into the conceptual approach to understanding metaphors, emphasizing the work of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson in highlighting the metaphorical nature of the world. She distinguishes military metaphors as a specific type of conceptual metaphor based on the theme of war, discussing how these metaphors embody aggressiveness, conflict, and strategy in non-military contexts. The article explores how military metaphors are used in business, politics, and other domains to simplify complex ideas and evoke emotional responses.

The article also examines the historical and cultural roots of military metaphors, noting their prevalence in human history and their role in structuring perception and understanding of the world. The author highlights the importance of military vocabulary in metaphorical expansion and discuss concepts associated with war that are commonly used in military metaphors.

In conclusion, the author defines military metaphor as a powerful linguistic tool that adds evaluative expressiveness to discourse. She argues that military metaphors play a significant role in shaping public opinion and activating associative and emotional fields. Overall, the article provides a thorough analysis of military metaphors and their impact on language and communication.

Key words: military metaphor, classifications of metaphors, types of metaphors, conceptual approach.

Стаття досліджує використання військових метафор у мові та дискурсі, зосереджуючись на тому, як ці метафори підсилюють зміст тексту та емоційний вплив. Авторка розглядає військові метафори у різних контекстах, таких як економіка, політика та медіа, та аналізує переваги й недоліки використання таких метафор. Вона спирається на роботи іноземних й українських науковців з теорії метафори, щоб всебічно дослідити військові метафори у сучасному англомовному медіа-дискурсі.

Стаття починається з визначення метафори як форми прихованого порівняння, яке допомагає проявити особливі риси предметів. Обговорюються різні класифікації метафор на основі поширеності, структури та функцій, підкреслюючи складність та неоднозначність метафоричних концепцій. Авторка аналізує типології метафор, представлені різними науковцями, зокрема, мертві метафори, кліше-метафори, лексичні метафори та авторські метафори.

Далі авторка заглиблюється у концептуальний підхід до розуміння метафор, акцентуючи увагу на роботах Джорджа Лакоффа та Марка Джонсона, які підкреслюють метафоричну природу світу. Вона виділяє військові метафори як специфічний тип концептуальної метафори, заснований на темі війни, обґрунтовуючи, як ці метафори втілюють агресивність, конфліктність та стратегічність в немілітарних контекстах. Стаття досліджує як військові метафори використовуються у бізнесі, політиці та інших сферах для спрощення складних ідей та емоційного впливу на читача.

Стаття також розглядає історичне та культурне підґрунтя військових метафор, відзначаючи їх поширеність в історії людства та їхню роль у структуруванні сприйняття та розуміння світу. Авторка підкреслює важливість військової лексики у метафоричному представленні та обговорює концепції, пов'язані з війною, які часто використовуються у військових метафорах.

На завершення, авторка визначає військову метафору як потужний мовний інструмент, що додає оцінної експресивності дискурсу. Вона стверджує, що військові метафори відіграють значну роль у формуванні громадської думки та активації асоціативних та емоційних полів. Загалом, стаття надає всебічний аналіз військових метафор та їхнього впливу на мову та комунікацію.

Ключові слова: військова метафора, класифікації метафор, типи метафор, концептуальний підхід.

Defining the problem. One of the least researched types of metaphor is the metaphor of war, or military, which relies on images, concepts, and terminology related to military actions and conflicts. This metaphor adds strength and emotion to the text, and helps to express complex ideas in a clear and convincing way. At the same time, this type of metaphor is used quite often, usually with the aim of influencing the recipient to form a certain perception of the metaphorized object. This special type of metaphorical expression has the power to generate associations with war scenarios such as battles, offensives, war actions, which activates the emotional connection between the speakers. Metaphorization of military vocabulary is quite common. Very often, a military metaphor is used to describe the state of the economy, financial markets, and the political situation in the world. Military metaphor can have different effects, both positive and negative, depending on the context of its use. The positive impact lies in the possibility of strengthening the unity, certainty and importance of measures, events or policies. On the other hand, a negative connotation can evoke associations with conflicts, threats and instability. Achievements of foreign and Ukrainian scientists in the field of metaphor theory, practical research provide a sufficient scientific basis for a comprehensive study of military metaphors that function in modern English-language media discourse. The analysis of the main theories of metaphor in the prism of mass media speech requires focusing primarily on the communicative approach, since the type of discourse analyzed belongs to the sphere of mass communication. The cognitive approach reveals the main trends of the new interpretation of metaphorical reality, reveals productive metaphorical models as those that the authors of media texts suggest readers learn.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The concept of metaphor is one of the most studied concepts in linguistics. Many scientists from various fields of knowledge tried to trace the role of metaphor in speech, language, in particular in the text, the importance of its use and its function. However, it can be argued without a doubt that the metaphor caused a lot of discussion not only in linguistics, but also became the object of study of philosophy, literary studies, psychology, psychoanalysis, hermeneutics and rhetoric. Such a desire for a comprehensive study of metaphor and the use of different interpretations of this concept is obvious, because metaphor is considered one of the ways of knowing the surrounding world, as well as by enriching language. Apart from this, metaphor is not only the basic medium of language, but also the mechanism of a language system based on anthropomorphism and transference from the concrete to the abstract [1, p. 46].

The definition of metaphor arises on the basis of the transfer of properties, so it can be called an abbreviated comparison: there is a replacement of what the speaker means with another meaning. According to O. Gorodilovskaya a metaphor is a hidden comparison that arises when using the name of one subject in relation to another and helps to identify a special feature of that subject [2, p. 21]. At the same time, the Ukrainian scientists believe that a given stylistic trope arises only when using a word figuratively, given the similarity of one object with another [3, p. 444]. Since the metaphor functions precisely in language, in scientific works we can often find the opinion that it should be considered as an individually realized technique of the speaker or writer, which he applies, adhering to a certain figure and using certain linguistic means. M. Johnson and J. Lakoff, claim that a metaphor is a linguistic expression that is fixed in language in the form of a

stable expression or phrase. It is believed that the metaphor gives the word a new lexical semantic meaning, and therefore it is a source of synonyms and phraseological expressions [4, p. 30]. In connection with the above, the ambiguity of the concept of metaphor becomes obvious, as well as the multifaceted perception of it.

It is also worth noting that until now there is a problem of studying metaphor to the full extent, because until recently it was considered only as a component of phraseological units or so-called clichés. However, in stylistics we find a detailed study of metaphorical comparisons, because they act as means of expressiveness of language [5, p. 345]. In particular, there are many traditional theories of metaphor, including comparison theory and the semantic approach. According to the above-mentioned theories, metaphor was considered as an abbreviated comparison, or only its semantic meaning was studied without studying the nature of the emergence of metaphor, its essence and role in language and speech.

In addition, there is an anthropocentric principle of studying metaphor, according to which metaphor is considered a means of thinking about the surrounding world, which takes into account all the knowledge and acquired experience of a person [6]. Currently, the cognitive approach to the study of metaphor is considered the main one in foreign works. According to this approach, the metaphorization process is considered as a certain action carried out on knowledge, namely as the transfer of certain information from the conceptual domain-source to the conceptual domain-purpose. Undoubtedly, the advantage of the cognitive principle is a new approach to the formation of metaphors, which consists in a combination of conceptual, linguistic and artistic spheres [7, p. 118].

Therefore, it is difficult to overestimate the importance of metaphor, because it is generally accepted that thanks to people's ability to think metaphorically, the development of language and culture was not only initiated, but also language was significantly enriched with synonyms and language clichés. Since metaphors are characterized by such features as abstraction, biplane and expressiveness, this gives grounds for the existence of different approaches to its study.

Setting the goals and tasks of the article. This article aims to provide a general outlook of a metaphor as a conceptual phenomenon in different discourses, focusing on military metaphor as a strong tool for shaping public opinion and activating associative and emotional fields.

The outline of the main research material. Metaphor is common in different types of discourse, where it performs different functions. At the same time, a specific discourse has different degrees of metaphoricality (for example, the discourse of spoken language and the discourse of official reception, political discourse and the discourse of poetry differ significantly among themselves, including the degree of metaphoricality) [8, p. 4].

The most common functions of the metaphor are as follows:

- nominative metaphor, which consists in replacing one descriptive meaning with another and serves as a source of homonymy;
- cognitive metaphor resulting from a shift in a combination of predicate words and creating polysemy;
- figurative metaphor, which is born as a result of the transition of descriptive meaning into predicative and serves the development of figurative meanings and synonymous means of speech.

In addition, metaphor also performs a manipulative function, directly or indirectly affecting the recipient, as well as a cognitive one that intersects with many other functions of the metaphor, being aimed at the process of learning about the surrounding world.

Taking into account the multifaceted nature of the metaphor, we can follow a large number of different classifications proposed by scientists who interpret the metaphorical process in different ways. By choosing certain criteria (parameters) for classification, many different types of metaphors can be named. For example, if you analyze metaphors according to their prevalence in language, you can name general and individual; by structure, one and two-member metaphors can be distinguished; according to the functional criterion – nominative, decorative, evaluative, etc.

P. Newmark identifies five types of metaphors: dead metaphors, cliché-metaphors, stock or standard metaphors, recent metaphors, and original or odd metaphors [9]. Van den Broeck distinguishes lexical metaphors, the images of which have been erased, conventional, fixed in the literature and individual, author's metaphors [10]. Lakoff and Johnson distinguish two types of metaphors: ontological, that allow you to see events, actions, emotions, ideas, etc. as a certain matter, and orientational that define one concept in terms of another, and organize the entire system of concepts in relation to each other [4]. Later, scientists developed a theory of systematic description of conceptual metaphors, classifying them according to cognitive function into three types: structural, orientational and ontological. The function of structural metaphors is to explain one, more complex, concept with the help of a more specific concept. An ontological metaphor is one that categorizes abstract phenomena, delineating them through personification and metonymy. The third type of metaphor, orientational, is understood by means of place and space [11, p. 480-483].

In domestic traditions metaphors are usually divided into simple and complex. The first ones are expressed by one image and do not always consist of one word, while the latter include several words that reinforce each other's image through the mutual use of contexts and their parallel functions.

The variety of metaphorical models requires their multidimensional classification. The most common classifications of metaphors in modern science is the following:

- 1) anthropomorphic metaphor;
- 2) physiological metaphor;
- 3) morbid metaphor;
- 4) kinship metaphor;
- 5) naturalomorphic metaphor;
- 6) zoomorphic metaphor;
- 7) sociomorphic metaphor;
- 8) criminal metaphor;
- 9) militar metaphor;
- 10) artifact metaphor [12, p. 45–46].

Thus, at the moment, there is no single definition of metaphor, nor a single system of classification of metaphors, since various researchers distinguish a significant number of criteria by which classification can be carried out.

We define metaphor, on the one hand, as a hidden comparison, constituting a figurative phrase, and on the other hand, as a metaphorical expression, that is a fixed phrase in everyday use.

The conceptual approach to understanding metaphors is now dominant in the world of linguistics. Traditionally, the founders of the theory of conceptual metaphor are considered to be the American scientists George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, who put forward the opinion that the whole world around is metaphorical in nature.

Researchers distinguish the military metaphor from other types of conceptual metaphor based on the topic of the source sphere «war». The first examples of the study of military metaphor within the theory of conceptual metaphor were carried out by the founders of this theory, J. Lakoff and. Johnson. In the future, domestic and foreign researchers addressed this problem: A. Alyamkina, A. Kaslova, T. Sineeva, L. Fedorova, A. Chudinov and others [13, p. 527].

War metaphor or military metaphor is a stylistic device using vocabulary and concepts associated with military action to describe phenomena that are not military in nature. Such metaphors embody aggressiveness, conflict, strategy, and are often found in political, economic, and social discourses. The use of military metaphors is based on certain ideas about war as a space of absolute confrontation, where there are clearly defined enemies, strategies, victories and defeats. In this context, the metaphor of war can serve as a tool for conceptualizing complex ideas or phenomena, using understandable and emotional images. For example, in business, *competition between companies can be described through the metaphors of the “battle for market share” or the “price war”*. In politics, election campaigns

are often described as “*battles for votes*” or “*wars for influence*”. This use of war metaphors not only simplifies complex processes, but also gives them emotional weight, stimulating aggressive or defensive reactions. Many researchers explain the growing use of the concept sphere «war» in most functioning discourses by active aggressive tendencies in modern society.

This trend is exacerbated by the fact that war is a constant aspect of human history, which affects the activation and development of military metaphor in language. The traditionally rich military experience of mankind was reflected in the national mentality, where military metaphors were considered an effective means for solving complex social problems. Therefore, military vocabulary becomes the main source of metaphorical expansion. In this context, researchers single out concepts directly associated with war, such as *conflict, struggle, confrontation, military actions, various types of wars, weapons, participants in war, military symbols and attributes, organization of military service*, as well as *the consequences and results of war* [14].

Today, the military metaphor is used in medicine (*war against cancer*), in sports journalism (*battle for victory*), in literary activities (*to crush someone*). It happens because military metaphors play an important role in structuring our perception and understanding of the world. They help to form conceptual frameworks through which we interpret different situations, while activating certain associative and emotional fields.

Conclusions. In conclusion, a military metaphor, in our opinion, can be defined as a metaphor that has a lexeme in its focus, which means military reality, while the context of the environment of this lexeme may not be related to military themes. A military metaphor is a strong means of linguistic expressiveness that realizes a special evaluative function. It is meant to form public opinion, give a negative or positive assessment of the described process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Казимір В. О. Значення метафори в репрезентації знань. *Наукові праці Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка. Філологічні науки*. 2013. № 32 (1). С. 45–49.
2. Городиловська О. Особливості передачі у перекладі українською мовою метафори (на матеріалі текстів науковотехнічного, публіцистичного та художнього стилю): магістр. дипломна робота. Київ, 2020. 136 с. URL: <https://shorturl.at/cnxRW> (дата звернення: 24.07.2024).
3. Мацько Л., Сидоренко О., Мацько О. Стилїстика української мови. Київ : Вища шк., 2003. 462 с.
4. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. 256 p.
5. Steen G., Gibbs R. Questions about metaphor in literature. *European Journal of English Studies*. 2004. Vol. 8, no. 3. P. 337–354. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1382557042000277421> (access date: 24.07.2024).
6. Ionescu A., Fransoo R. Metaphorical Patterns in Anthropocene Fiction. *Narrating the Mesh*. 2021. P. 139–158.
7. Казимір В. О. Значення когнітивного підходу в дослідженні метафори. *Наукові праці Кам'янець-Подільського національного університету імені Івана Огієнка. Філологічні науки*. 2012. № 30. С. 118–121.
8. Herrmann J. B., Sardinha T. B. Metaphor in specialist discourse. 2015. P. 3–14.
9. Newmark P. *A Textbook of Translation*. Shanghai foreign language education press, 1988. 292 p. URL: <https://archive.org/details/ATextbookOfTranslationByPeterNewmark/page/n1/mode/lup> (access date: 24.07.2024).
10. van den Broeck R. The limits of translatability exemplified by metaphor translation. *Poetics Today*. 1981. 2, P. 73–87.
11. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Conceptual Metaphor in Everyday Language. *Shaping Entrepreneurship Research*. 2020. P. 475–504. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315161921-21> (access date: 24.07.2024).
12. Одинецька Л. В. Роль метафори в засобах масової інформації. 2017. С. 44–47. URL: <http://surl.li/sxinh> (дата звернення: 24.07.2024).
13. Шапран Д. Мілітарна метафора в українській маркетинговій термінології. *Молодий вчений: Науковий журнал*. 2016. № 5 (32). С. 526–530.
14. Mutch A. Organization Theory and Military Metaphor: Time for a Reappraisal. *Organization*. 2006. Vol. 13, no. 6. P. 751–769. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508406068503> (access date: 24.07.2024).