Aleksander Kiklewicz
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6140-6368
University of Warmian and Mazury in Olsztyn

THE METAPHORICAL NOMINATION OF WAR IN JOURNALISTIC TEXTS ON THE RUSSIAN INVASION OF UKRAINE – AS EXEMPLIFIED BY THE WEEKLY "POLITYKA"

Abstract: The article deals with the metaphorical nomination of war characteristics, i.e. linguistic (grammatical and semantic) aspects of metaphorical expressions containing the noun 'war' in journalistic texts on the Russian-Ukrainian war of 2022-2023. Based on a corpus consisting of constructions extracted from articles published in the weekly magazine "Polityka", the author describes these expressions in terms of the grammatical properties of the collocate, the case form of the noun 'war', as well as aspects of metaphorical nomination. The research analysis, leads, inter alia, to the conclusion that the linguistic nomination of war is so diverse that it is impossible to claim, in the spirit of linguistic determinism, that the existing schemes of the linguistic (lexical and phrasal) nomination of war influence the awareness of language users and the culturally shaped mental conceptualization of war.

Keywords: metaphor, mental conceptualization, conceptual metaphor, framing, journalistic text, war, Ukraine

Introduction

According to the definition in the *Great Dictionary of the Polish Language*[1], the noun *wojna* 'war' has the following meaning: 'an organized armed struggle, usually waged on a large scale and for a long time, in which states, nations or large social groups participate'. Armed struggle, in turn, is a type of collective action that lasts for a certain period of time and is the subject of direct or secondary nomination. The metaphorical nomination addresses as many actions as there are different characteristics. On the one hand, there exist literal expressions, such as prepositions of time in constructions with the noun *wojna*, e.g.:

(1) przed wojną
    w czasie wojny

---

[1] ttps://wsjp.pl/szukaj/podstawowe/wyniki?szukaj=wojna (accessed: 20.03.2023).

    na początku wojny
    po wojnie

Constructions of this type also contain some verbs whose valence predicts an argument position of a sentential nature (names of events, processes or states), cf.:

(2) zapobiegać wojnie
    spowodować wojnę
    uczestniczyć w wojnie
    uzasadnić wojnę etc.

On the other hand, one can also find so-termed figurative expressions – the simplest example being the following:

(3) zginął na wojnie
  | zginął na autostradzie

The preposition *na* appears here in a secondary sense, as indicated by the transformation:

(4) zginął, biorąc aktywny udział w wojnie

Expressions of this kind are of more interest from a functional-semantic point of view because they show the human ability to determine the characteristics of one phenomenon by referring to the characteristics of the other. Referencing thus relies on the associative processor of the human mind, which operates largely on the principle of analogy. The phenomenon is, therefore, important for identifying the elements of the concept of WAR) that are associative and, consequently, for creating a network of such associations.

    Both the characteristics required to define them and their associative references change under different conditions of linguistic activity. In fiction, particularly in lyrical poetry, a metaphor primarily performs a captivating function, which is related to the fact that metaphors of war are unique, and the text is extremely bizarre due to the non-standard association of two concepts or two conceptual areas, as can be observed, for instance, in Maria Pawlikowska-Jasnorzewska's poem *War is just a flower* (*Wojna to tylko kwiat*).

    In journalistic texts, a different pragmatic strategy prevails, and therefore the metaphorical nomination here has mainly an ergonomic function: metaphorical expressions such as the *temperature of the discussion* are repeated, allowing for compactness and dynamism. Yes, one could write about *an intense discussion in which the participants expressed their different opinions in a very emotional way*, however, this form of language is does not correspond to the conventions of media discourses.

The article examines the problem of the metaphorical nomination of war (or, more precisely, its characteristics) in journalistic texts. The texts used are those published in the weekly magazine "Polityka" in the period from 24 February, 2022 to 3 March, 2023, the subject of which is the Russian invasion of Ukraine. In order to create the corpus of metaphorical expressions, a subscription to the Internet magazine: https://www.polityka.pl. was chosen. This weekly provides a source of empirical material, which is justified by the fact that it is the leading Polish magazine on socio-political issues devoting a great deal of attention to the war in Ukraine.

1. Metaphor in cognitive-semantic terms

In recent decades, there has been a growing interest in functional semantics – as defined by V. A. Zvegincev (1967, 58) or operational semantics – as defined by S. Ullmann (1964, 55): it seeks to explain how meaning functions, i.e. it depends on social, cultural, cognitive, contextual and other factors, and also contributes to the implementation of higher-order functions, e.g. pragmatic or stylistic ones. According to the above concept, the true meaning of a sign can be understood by observing how it is used (Ullmann 1964, 64). Cognitive semantics is derived from this very line of research, and focuses attention on the aspect of linguistic units directly related to the mental (and always culturally and pragmatically contextualized) categorization of objects and phenomena. Metaphor is treated by cognitive scientists as a form of satisfying the human need for nomination in the conditions of the coherence of information processing centers characteristic of the human mind, which creates a network of associations between concepts. Although this is not the only function of metaphor, its importance for linguistic activity is immense: owing to the analogy of concepts, the lexical nomination of phenomena on the basis of their similarity becomes possible.

As can be seen, in the light of cognitology, a metaphor has an interactive essence: it is based on the associative relationship between two conceptual categories (or domains):

> Most metaphorical expressions are not to be treated in isolation, but as linguistic realisations of conceptual metaphors: These consist in the systematic connection of two different conceptual domains, one of which functions as target domain (X) with the other supplying the source domain (Y) of the metaphorical mapping. In this manner, X is conceptualised as Y, one conceptual domain is understood by taking recourse to another domain of experience (Jäkel 2002, 21).

It is an extension of the concept of I. A. Richards (1950), who treats the meaning of metaphorical expressions as the result of the interaction of two meanings: the main and the auxiliary. According to M. Black (1979, 28), a set of implications related to the auxiliary meaning is applied to the main meaning. Thus, the cognitive theory of metaphor is based on the assumption that all cognitive operations are essentially interactive (Lakoff | Johnson 1980, 178).

Regular polysemy was already considered in traditional semantics, i.e. a kind of secondary use of signs based on the affiliation of the main and derivative meanings to broader semantic categories. Colour names, for instance, are known to be widely used to denote mental states or dispositions. Developing this concept, G. Lakoff (1977) emphasizes the fact that operations with signs are guided by general rules, which he classifies as linguistic gestalts. Thus, the interpretation of metaphorical expressions requires, in addition to the determination of the main meaning and the auxiliary meanings, a reference to the interaction of the domains represented by each type of meaning, as illustrated below.

Interaction of meanings, characteristics: Interaction of domains:

$x_1 R y_1$ $X R Y$

$x_2 R y_2$

$x_3 R y_3$

…

This became the basis for an alternative interpretation of metaphorical expressions to the theory of polysemy, and consists in emphasizing the interaction of domains, referred to in cognitive semantics as projection. The condition for such an explanation is the regularity of metaphorical expressions, since it allows the metaphor to be recognized as a semantic function that assigns elements of the domain of meaning (i.e. the source domain) to the elements of the domain of the definition (i.e. the target domain). For example, G. Lakoff and M. Johnson (1980, 11) found the regularity of metaphorical terms of language and speech, cf.:

(5) You have to put each concept into words very carefully.
(6) Try to fit more thoughts into fewer words
(7) Insert these ideas elsewhere in the paragraph.
(8) Do not force your meaning into the wrong words.

provides the basis for explaining the metaphorical model LANGUAGE EXPRESSIONS ARE CONTAINERS FOR MEANINGS as well as for projecting some features of one conceptual category onto another.

Most metaphorical expressions are of the type defined by G. Miller (1979, 230ff.) as predicative metaphors. Their essence lies in the metaphorical nomination of object properties, and is described by Miller as follows:

$$(\exists\, F)\, [F\, (x)\, \&\, F\, (y)] \tag{1}$$

In fact, it is not only that a given predicate (in the form of a verb, an adjective or a noun) is used in two different contexts, but also that, firstly, in various cases there is a possibility of non-metaphorical nomination of characteristics; secondly, there is a certain similarity between the main meaning and the auxiliary meaning; thirdly, there is an association between the names of the objects (bearers of characteristics); fourthly – there is an association between the domains they represent:

$$F_1\, (x)\, \&\, F_1\, (y) \tag{2}$$
$$F_1\, (x)\, \&\, F_2\, (x) \tag{3}$$
$$F_1\, R\, F_2 \tag{4}$$
$$x\, R\, y \tag{5}$$
$$X\, R\, Y \tag{6}$$

The way in which the mechanism works can be illustrated taking the example of one of the metaphors of war:

(9) Błagam, zatrzymajcie wojnę! ("Polityka"; 27 II 2022)

The verb *zatrzymać* 'to stop' has the basic meaning 'to cause a person or thing to stop moving forward', its second argument is objective:

(10) Policjant zatrzymał przechodnia.
     N (x)   V (P)   N (y)

In the secondary sense ('to cause a certain phenomenon, process, action, state, etc. to cease to exist'), it is a second-order predicate that requires the presence of a propositional argument (e.g. the noun *war*). The semantic analysis of sentence (10) according to the above scheme might look like this:

ZATRZYMAĆ (wojnę) & ZATRZYMAĆ (przechodnia)
ZATRZYMAĆ (wojnę) & SPOWODOWAĆ NIETRWANIE, ZAKOŃCZYĆ (wojnę)
SPOWODOWAĆ NIETRWANIE, ZAKOŃCZYĆ TO (JEST TO SAMO, CO) ZATRZYMAĆ
WOJNA TO (JEST TO SAMO, CO) PRZECHODZIEŃ
ZJAWISKO, PROCES, DZIAŁANIE, STAN TO (JEST TO SAMO, CO) RUCHOMY PRZEDMIOT

From a cognitive-semantic point of view, the above explanation contains two important pieces of information. First, the metaphorical nomination arises from the need to express a specific characteristic of war: <make non-duration, end>.

In principle, this can be done in a direct (non- such a form is inappropriate, mainly due to its excessive abstraction and length. metaphorical) phrasal form, but in a variety of communicative situations. Second, the metaphorical nomination is rooted in the interaction of conceptual domains WAR | ACTION (R) A MOVABLE MATERIAL OBJECT. Contrary to the claims of the most radical cognitive scientists[2], there is no reason to say that the conceptualization (i.e. mental representation, or, more simply, understanding) of war is derived from knowledge of moving objects. Metaphorical projections based on the domain relations are profiled and concern only selected properties of objects. Moreover, such models are highly abstract, which clearly contradicts the fact that language users (in certain discourses) avoid abstraction when using names. The problem of the psychological reality of the conceptual metaphors has been discussed in various publications (Charteris-Black 2004; Cserép 2014; Katz | Law 2010; Kiklewicz 2019; 2020; 2022 et al.; Krennmayr 2011; Leshchova 2017; Maalej 2014; Vervaeke | Kennedy 2004;). The fact that conceptual metaphors such as MIND IS BODY or EMOTION IS AN ANTAGONIST do not occur in the cognitive system of an "ordinary" language user does not mean that they are fictions. Following the German researcher R. Keller (1994, 84ff.), they can be treated as phenomena of the third kind, i.e. phenomena that are neither natural nor cultural, but have something in common with both the first and the second. They are the result of human activity, primarily of human experience (as are cultural phenomena), however, they are not the goals of human activity (as are natural phenomena). Conceptual metaphors exist in the same way that there is – "out of nowhere" – a traffic jam on a highway or a path on a lawn.

2. Metaphors of war: the state of research

The study of metaphor can be divided into two directions: semasiological and onomasiological. The former, according to the principle of the "means > function", involves the analysis of the attested uses of specific conceptual domains as a source of metaphorical projections. Such a research scheme (albeit without cognitive terminology) is traditionally adopted both in lexicographic practice and in poetics, cf. the description of the metaphorical and connotative semantics of wind in English Romantic poetry in: Abrams 1960.

---

2   See one such statement: "[Conceptual metaphor] is one that we live by in this culture; it structures the actions we perform in arguing. [...] ARGUMENT is partially structured, understood, performed, and talked about in terms of WAR. The concept is metaphorically structured, the activity is metaphorically structured, and, consequently, the language is metaphorically structured" (Lakoff | Johnson 1980, 4).

Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 4 ff.) have already described war as one of such source domain that operates quite extensively in metaphorical nomination. By observing linguistic expressions:

(11) Your claims are indefensible.
(12) He attacked every weak point in my argument.
(13) His criticisms were spot on.
(14) I demolished his argument.
(15) I've never won an argument with him.
(16) You disagree? OK, shoot!
(17) If you use that strategy, he'll wipe you out.
(18) He shot down all my arguments.[3]

they came to the conclusion about the existence of the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR:

> We can actually win or lose arguments. We see the person we are arguing with as an opponent. We attack their positions and we defend our own. We gain and lose ground. We plan and use strategies. If we find a position indefensible, we may abandon it and adopt a new line of attack. Much of what we do in argument is partly structured by the concept of war. There may not be a physical battle, but there is a verbal battle, and the structure of an argument - attack, defense, counterattack, etc. - reflects this (Lakoff | Johnson 1980, 4).

The above conceptual metaphor is not the only application of the concept of WAR, ARMED STRUGGLE in the secondary nomination, its other applications are discussed in subsequent publications, for instance in the article by M. Żmudzka--Brodnicka (2013, 165ff.), which examines the imagery of war in contemporary sports journalism. For example, metaphorical expressions are common in such texts:

(19) wygrać | przegrać mecz
(20) zdobyć punkty | gol
(21) stracić punkty
(22) poddać się bez walki
(23) pokonać drużynę przeciwnika
(24) rozstrzelać przeciwnika
(25) Drużyna Stefana Majewskiego okopała się na własnej połowie.

The author assumes that the method of constructing an utterance through the selection and choice of appropriate linguistic units that create frameworks and conceptual models has a significant influence on the recipient's understanding of it,

---

3   E. Lipowicz (2015, 96) describes Polish expressions of this kind.

and, on the formation of his or her foundations and patterns of behaviour, because cognitive frameworks and models convey not only a specific language, but also a system of beliefs and values.[4] According to this assumption, the researcher believes that the metaphors of war are marked in axiological and pragmatic terms, expressing the aggressive attitude of both fans and journalists towards one of the participating sides. On the one hand, the common aspect of sport and war is <competition>; on the other, the reference to war additionally implies the characteristic of <fight>. Thus, evaluative and expressive connotations are associated with the content of such metaphors.

An overview of publications on the SPORT IS WAR concept in English can be found in the article: Najjari | Mohammadi 2018.

There is an extensive linguistic literature (Flusberg | Matlock | Thibodeau 2018; Harrington 2012; Lahlou | Abdul Rahim 2022 et al.; Lupton 2012; Sontag 1978; Wicke | Bolognesi 2020) that, since the Middle Ages, various types of diseases and epidemics (such as the recent COVID-19 pandemic) have typically been described in terms of war metaphors (usually depicting the disease as an armed and merciless aggressor). According to data in the work Karlberg | Buell 2005, 17% of the articles published in "Time" magazine between 1981 and 2000 contained at least one war metaphor.[5]

A. Pastucha-Blin (2022, 4ff.) points out that the war metaphors in body care texts refer to specific aspects, and many of them correspond to different stages of combat: preparation for war, warfare, tactics, attack, defense, allies, and so forth.

There is also a confrontational aspect of research on conceptual metaphor: researchers compare, for instance, the frequency with which this or that root domain occurs in different languages. Thus, R. Gražytė and N. Maskaliūnienė (2009) describe the conceptual metaphor DEALING WITH A PROBLEM IS WAR, which, according to their research, is similarly represented in Lithuanian and English. P. Dvořák (2012, 59) notes that the metaphor GOVERNANCE IS WAR is similarly realized in English and Czech, as reflected in the similarities between the original and the translation.

I. Eriksson (2019, 22 ff.), who has studied the function of conceptual metaphors in political texts in English, Spanish and Swedish, argues that they also include the metaphor of war. For example, in one sentence,

---

[4]   I. Eriksson (2019, 7) reports on the evaluation of metaphorical expressions in the political discourses of contemporary Sweden. For example, Stefan Löfven, the leader of the Social Democrats, sharply criticized his opponents in a Facebook post for inappropriate terms for refugees (such as *flows* or *volumes*). For more on the argumentative and persuasive function of metaphors (especially in political, religious and scientific discourses), see: Olechowska 2018, 140ff.; Völker 2019, 16ff; Werner 2004.

[5]   On the metaphor of war during election campaigns, see: Brzoza-Kolorz 2020.

(26) Action against criminal networks of smugglers and traffickers is first and fore-
most a way of preventing the exploitation of migrants by criminal networks.

there is the verb to *fight*, which in its basic sense means to take part in a fight
involving the exchange of physical blows or the use of weapons. The author suggests
that while there may be situations where physical confrontation and fighting
is necessary in the apprehension of smugglers and traffickers, in sentence (26) the
verb indicates other measures that must be taken to prevent criminal networks from
operating. According to Eriksson, the conceptual metaphor EXPLOITATION IS
AN ENEMY is realized here, although it could also be expressed in another way –
as ELIMINATION IS WAR | FIGHT.

    The second, onomasiological direction of research on conceptual metaphor
is based on the principle of "function > middle". In this case, the target domain
is the starting point, and it concerns the source domains used for its indirect
nomination. The cognitive domain thesis is clearly contradicted by the fact that
the target and source domains can be interchanged. This suggests that the directed
nature of the metaphorization process is relative, for instance through the metaphors
of war. As mentioned in the introduction, there are a large number of metaphorical
expressions in which war is described figuratively. By way of illustration, Eriksson
(2019, 20ff.) notes that such metaphorical expressions are widespread in political
texts, and that the most common metaphorical models are:

    WAR IS ENEMY
    WAR IS PLACE OF CONFINEMENT
    WAR IS APPLIED FORCE
    WAR IS OPPONENT
    WAR IS BOUNDED | LIMITED SPACE

The research provides a comprehensive understanding of the metaphorical nomination
of the characteristics of war. For instance, in analyzing the system of metaphors
used to justify the First Gulf War, Lakoff (1992) identified two key regularities:
WAR IS POLITICS and WAR IS A VIOLENT CRIME. In her monograph on "the
discourses of war'', M. Fabiszak (2007, 114ff.) explains a number of metaphorical
models that appear mainly in journalistic texts:

    WAR IS A THEATRE | THEATRE PLAY
    WAR IS A GAME
    WAR IS BALANCE
    WAR IS NATURAL FORCE
    WAR IS GEOMETRY
    WAR IS RAPE
    WAR IS DISEASE

WAR IS BUSINESS
WAR IS CRUSADE
WAR IS CLEANING etc.

Other authors (Ahrens | Burgers | Zhong 2022; Hanusch 2014; Mihas 2005) provide further metaphorical models:

WAR IS A CONTAINER
WAR IS A TRAP
WAR IS GAMBLING
WAR IS NATURAL EVENT etc.

It is worth noting that the aforementioned conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR can also be transformed into, namely, it takes the form of WAR IS AN ARGUMENT. However, there is no mention of transformation in Lakoff and Johnson's book (indeed, it would destroy the coherence of their theory). In fact, it is evidenced by language such as:

(27) Wróg odpowiedział ogniem artyleryjskim.
(28) ogień zwrotny
(29) Wszyscy usłyszeli odpowiedź dział pancernika Schleswig-Holstein.
(30) niejednoznaczny atak torpedowy
(31) przekonujący atak
(32) Głosy dział zamilkły.
(33) Ostatnia stronica wojny.

Similarly, Fabiszak (2007, 124) discusses the conceptual metaphor WAR IS DISPUTE.

A serious weakness of the majority of metaphorical models (including those of war) found in explication publications is that they are absolute in nature, i.e. of the form X IS Y. However, as already indicated, these models are valid only for certain characteristics of objects. As shown in example (3), the conceptual metaphor WAR IS A PLACE, SURFACE has its specific dimension. It concerns the characteristics of war <participation in war>. Nevertheless, this metaphor is outdated in situations where it is necessary to name other characteristics of the concept of WAR.

3. Corpus analysis and discussion of the results

Following the analysis of the journalistic texts, a database was created containing the following types of information: 1) lemma, i.e. a metaphorical construction with the component *wojna* in one of the grammatical forms; there are 114 such constructions in the database; 2) language illustration; 3) grammatical characteristics of the collocation (V, N, Adj); 4) the grammatical case of the noun *wojna*; 5) aspect, i.e. the characteristics of war (metaphorical meaning of the collocation); 6) source domain; 7) attribution, i.e. information on whether the metaphor is unique and represents a specific form of defining war, or whether it is regular and occurs also in the description of other actions and states. Table 1 lists all the expressions recorded in the corpus in alphabetical order.

Table 1. List of metaphorical expressions

asymetria wojny	stoczyć się ku wojnie	wojna się wymyka
audyt wojny	środek wojny	wojna się zbliża
bawić się w wojnę	teatr wojny	wojna szalała
biało-czarna wojna	tło wojny	wojna to test
bieżąca wojna	trzymać się (z daleka) od wojny	wojna urasta (do skali)
bóg wojny	umieścił wojnę	wojna usprawiedliwia
ciągnąć wojnę	w cieniu wojny	wojna wisi (w powietrzu)
ciężar wojny	walec wojny	wojna wkroczyła
czuć wojnę	wciągać w wojnę	wojna wprowadziła (zamieszanie)
druga strona wojny	wdepnąć w wojnę	wojna wybuchła
epicentrum wojny	wejść do wojny	wojna wygląda (tak a tak)
fundować (sobie) wojnę	wejść w wojnę	wojna wyostrzyła
hit wojny	widmo wojny	wojna wywróciła
ikona wojny	wina wojny	wojna zabierze
im dalej w wojnę (tym więcej…)	wojna (nie) cofnie	wojna zastała
kibicowanie wojnie	wojna (nie) puka	wojna zatruwa
leciutka wojna	wojna (nie) wyszła	wojna zawisła
losy wojny	wojna (wysokiego) napięcia	wojna zburzy
meandry wojny	wojna dotknęła	wojna zlikwidowała
mgła wojny	wojna dyktuje	wpływ wojny
odegrać (rolę) w wojnie	wojna gaśnie	wpuszcza wojnę
odpowiedź na wojnę	wojna gorąca	wpuścić się w wojnę
odsłona wojny	wojna jest matką (problemów)	wsadzenie wojny
patrzeć na wojnę	wojna nabrała rumieńców	wybuch wojny
podejmować wojnę	wojna nadchodzi	wycinek wojny
podejście do wojny	wojna odsłoniła	wyczyn wojny
prowadzić wojnę	wojna pochłania	wygaszenie wojny

próg wojny	wojna przekroczy (granicę)	wyjść z wojny
przebieg wojny	wojna przerodzi się	wyprzeć wojnę
przeciągać wojnę	wojna przestała być widoczna	wywołać wojnę
przeniesienie wojny	wojna przeszła	zainwestować w wojnę
przenieść wojnę	wojna przyszła	zamrozić wojnę
przyglądać się wojnie	wojna puka (do drzwi)	zwrot ku wojnie
rodem z wojny	wojna rzuciła	zatrzymać wojnę
rozgrywać wojnę	wojna się cofnęła	wojna się zbliża
rozpętać wojnę	wojna się przeniosła	zimna wojna
scenariusz wojny	wojna się rozgorzała	znosić wojnę
skala wojny	wojna się rozleje	zwrot ku wojnie

The following chapters will examine the distinctive features of metaphorical expressions.

3.1. Collocate

Of the 114 constructions, only two are cases where a nominal metaphor (in Miller's terminology) occurs in the sentences:

(34) Wojna to niezrównany test dla broni. (10 I 2023)
(35) Ta wojna jest matką wielu dręczących nas dziś problemów gospodarczych. (29 I 2023)

The remaining constructions are predicative metaphors. Metaphorical words (showing the characteristics of war) are verbs, nouns and adjectives, and their percentage in the corpus is as follows: V – 70 (61%), N – 36 (32%), Adj – 5 (4%). As can be seen, the metaphorical nomination of the characteristics of war is mainly realized by verbs, with a minimal occurrence of adjectives. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the expressions *zimna wojna* (cold war) and *gorąca wojna* (hot war) appear with considerable frequency in the journalistic texts, which indicates their significant contribution. Constructions with the phrase pattern "im dalej w N_{acc}, tym więcej | bardziej":

(36) Im dalej w wojnę, tym więcej światła pada na zawiłości chińsko-rosyjskiego partnerstwa. (7 III 2022)

In the general (grammatical) classification of collocations, this construction is regarded as a separate category.

3.2. Case

The noun *wojna* occurs in different cases, with the exception of the instrumental case. The percentages of vary, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. shows the percentage of each case form of the noun wojna

Case	Number of constructions	%
nom	48	42
gen	35	31
including: prep + gen	5	4
dat	5	4
including: prep + dat	2	2
acc	25	21
including: prep + acc	9	8
loc	1	1

As can be seen, the noun *wojna* is most frequently used in the nominative case, which accounts for almost approximately half of all instances. The genitive and accusative forms are also quite common. From this it can be concluded that the most frequent occurrence is the representation of war in an agentive or causative position. It is no coincidence that verbal constructions with the nominative case implement a kind of metaphor in which the exponent of the war character refers to the source domain PERSON or the domain LIVING BEING. For example:

(37) wojna przyszła
wojna wkroczyła
wojna szalała
wojna wyostrzyła
wojna zatruwa
wojna zlikwidowała

Statistical analysis of the data indicates that out of 48 constructions with the nominative case, 34 (over 70%) represent the source domains PERSON and LIVING BEING, and vice versa. This is evidenced by the fact that out of 42 constructions using these two domains, 34 (over 80%) contain a noun *wojna* in the nominative case.

3.3. Aspect

The analysis made it possible to distinguish 27 aspects of the target domain WAR within the corpus. Each of them represents the information contained in the so-called auxiliary meaning of the polysemy. This is illustrated by a few sentences:

(38) *Skala wojny* nie dopuszcza już tradycyjnie nieskutecznych rozwiązań tego rodzaju. (11 X 2022)
aspect: intensity

(39) Jednak wszystko to nie narusza *asymetrii tej wojny.* (26 X 2022)
aspect: arrangement of elements, actants, participation in war

(40) *Wojnę można tak ciągnąć* w nieskończoność. (7 VI 2022)
aspect: to continue, to wage war

(41) *Wojna znów przerodzi się* w działania bardziej manewrowe. (23 II 2023)
aspect: sequence, course of events during the war

The need for a metaphorical nomination does not stem from the concept of war itself (as it is lexicalized), but rather from its characteristics, which are typically conceptualized and challenging/difficult to define in the context of colloquial communication and journalistic discourse. It is possible to imagine alternative forms of all the above utterances that would include forms of direct, non-metaphorical nomination of these characteristics, as exemplified below:

(42) *Intensywność wojny* nie dopuszcza już tradycyjnie nieskutecznych rozwiązań tego rodzaju.

(43) Jednak wszystko to nie narusza *niezrównoważonego układu elementów tej wojny.*

(44) *Wojnę można tak uprawiać* w nieskończoność.

(45) *Kolejność, postęp wydarzeń w trakcie wojny zmieni się taki sposób,* że będą realizowane działania bardziej manewrowe.

Comparing the original and the paraphrase, it can be seen that in some cases the metaphorical designation is more accessible, ergonomic, and easy to understand, while in others it is more expressive and suggestive, affecting the imagination and emotions of the addressee. These aspects are listed in the Table 3.

Table 3. Aspects of target domain

Aspects of metaphorical nomination	Number of constructions (lemmas)
war as a factor, effect or, condition	25
duration	19
place, location	9
to continue to wage war	9
intensity	8
sequence, progress of events during the war	7
to cause a war	5
interpretation, justification of war	5
element of war	4

Aspects of metaphorical nomination	Number of constructions (lemmas)
war as a perspective of development of events	4
the nature of war	3
arrangement of elements, actants, participation in war	2
valuing war	2
influence the duration and progress of events in the course of war	2
alternatives to war	1
experiencing war	1
actions against the war	1
another kind of war	1
testing the tools of war	1
war observation	1
discussing war	1
resemblance to war	1
advocating war	1
event, action during the war	1
resources used for war	1
compliance of the war with the purpose, the plan	1

As can be observed, the regularity of the metaphorical nomination of these or other aspects varies. Two of them are prominent: <war as a factor, effector, and condition> and the <duration of war>. The first aspect concerns the war, which causes various kinds of events, mainly social, economic and demographic changes. The metaphors used for this purpose are typically based on verbs, with the noun *war* appearing in the nominative case. For instance:

(46) wojna puka (do drzwi)
(47) wojna dyktuje
(48) wojna jest matką (problemów)
(49) wojna odsłoniła
(50) wojna pochłania
(51) wojna rozbije (jedności)
(52) wojna wyostrzyła etc.

The duration of the war implies its continuity in time, as well as its phases (beginning, middle phase, end). In theory, it is possible to use phase verbs in such situations, for example: *the war has begun, the war is ending, the war is still going on*, etc. However, journalists frequently opt for metaphors for this purpose:

(53) wojna przyszła
(54) wojna ruszyła
(55) wojna rozgorzała
(56) wojna się zbliża
(57) wojna wisi (w powietrzu)
(58) wojna wkroczyła (w fazę)
(59) wojna wybuchła etc.

A significant research question is to what extent these aspects of metaphorical nomination correspond to the structure of the concept of WAR in its form, as presented in the cognitive literature. A helpful source of information in this regard may be the FrameNet online database[6].The English noun *war* (together with the nouns *altercation, battle, bout, brawl, clash, combat, conflict, confront, duel, engagement, fight, gunfight, hostility, infighting, row, scuffle, shootout, showdown, skirmish, spat, squabble, standoff, strife, struggle, tiff, tussle, warfare* etc.) forms a framework, defined as follows: "A hostile encounter between opposing forces (Side_1 and Side_2, collectively conceptualizable as Sides) over a disputed issue in order to achieve a specific goal". In the framework structure, five slots of a core nature (i.e. directly implied by the concept of war) and twelve slots of an optional, incidental, non-core nature were distinguished. The left column of Table 4 shows the aspects of war from the FrameNet database, while the right one the relevant aspects of the metaphorical nomination identified during the study.

Table 4. Comparison of aspects

Aspects (slots) in the FrameNet	Aspects of metaphorical nomination	Number of constructions (lemmas)
CORE:		
issue		
purpose		
side_1		
side_2		
sides		
NON-CORE:		
degree	intensity	8
depictive	action against the war advocating war	2
duration	duration	19
explanation	interpretation, justification of war valuing war	7

---

6   https://framenet.icsi.berkeley.edu/fndrupal/about (accessed: 09.03.2023).

Aspects (slots) in the FrameNet	Aspects of metaphorical nomination	Number of constructions (lemmas)
instrument	element of war event, action during the war resources used for war	6
internal cause	cause a war influence the duration and course of events during a war	7
manner	the nature of war arrangement of elements, actants/actors, participants in the war	5
means	sequence, progress of events during the war	7
particular iteration		
place	place, location	9
result	war as a factor, effector, condition	25
time		
	to continue, to conduct the war	9
	war as a perspective on the development of events	4
	alternatives to war	1
	experiencing war	1
	another kind of war	1
	testing the tools of war	1
	war observation	1
	discussing war	1
	Similarity to war	1
	Adherence of the war to purpose, plan	1

A comparison of the two lists reveals that the aspects identified as core in the FrameNet database are not included in the metaphorical nomination, which refers mainly to non-core aspects. The most important aspects are <result> and <duration>. In addition, there are aspects of metaphorical nomination that are not included in the FrameNet database. These constructions account for approximately 20% of the corpus, which is a remarkable number. It may indicate that the zone of incidental features is diverse and that it is possible to distinguish between second-order and third-order alternatives to war, and so forth. The latter were not included in the FrameNet database.

3.4. Source domain

Metaphorical nomination posits that the characteristics of the source domain are employed to determine those of the target domain, assuming some degree of similarity between the two. Analysis of the corpus revealed a considerable degree of diversity in the imagery of war, with 38 source domains identified (Table 5).

Table 5. List of source domains

Source domain	Number of constructions	Source domain	Number of constructions
living being	23	popular music	1
material object, thing	23	supernatural being	1
person	19	fire	1
room, area	8	undertaking	1
liquid	2	economic venture	1
bullet	2	social enterprise	1
fire, bonfire	2	nature, air	1
food product	2	question, complaint	1
theatrical play, film	2	direction, way	1
building	1	theater	1
sport team	1	test	1
work of art	1	route	1
newspaper	1	earthquake	1
puddle	1	electric device	1
religious cult	1	spectacle	1
forest	1	game	1
people of god	1	smell	1
machine	1	sports competitions	1
place	1	animal	1

As in the case of aspects, there are the most regular categories and, for the most part, those that occur only once. As already mentioned, the personalization of war is widespread in linguistic behaviour, with the use of terms typical of living things (23 constructions) and of people (19 constructions). Another common category is MATERIAL OBJECT, THING – 23 constructions.

The prevalence and unconventional nature of some metaphorical models (such as WAR IS AN ELECTRICAL DEVICE or WAR IS A WORK OF ART'', as well as their inherent inconsistency, do not provide sufficient grounds for claiming that such models are "gestalts of the mind", as suggested by Kiklewicz (2006, 39). This assertion is contrary to the prevailing view among scientists. cognitive In fact, such metaphorical models of this kind are used to lexically nominate certain aspects of the target domain. For example, the first of the above models cited above is realized in the expression

(60) wojna wysokiego napięcia

and is used to express the characteristic <intensity of warfare>, and therefore cannot be generalized or its role in mental processes exaggerated. The metaphor

is based on the characteristic <high voltage in an electrical device, and the phrasal exponent *wysokiego napięcia* has the general meaning <high intensity of activities or processes>. The same applies to other metaphorical models. The WAR IS LIVING BEING model is implemented in relation to 11 (out of 27) aspects of the target domain, while the WAR IS A PERSON model is implemented in relation to 7 aspects. As can be seen, even the most regular metaphorical models are located in specific clusters of the associative network.

3.5. Assignment

Another question is to what extent these or other metaphorical constructions are characteristic of war, and to what extent they are broad and occur in the case of metaphorical nomination of other actions, events, processes and states. The following examples will illustrate the difference:

> (61) W Donbasie od maja do końca września *prowadzono wojnę* na wyniszczenie. (6 XI 2022)
> (62) Nie chcą tu *rozpętywać nowej wojny*. (23 X 2022)
> (63) *Wojna wybuchła* trzy miesiące później. (7 II 2023)
> (64) *Wojna wysokiego napięcia*. (29 XI 2022)
> (65) Ukraina nie dała *się wpuścić w wojnę* na wyniszczenie. (3 XI 2022)
> (66) Czy więc najlepszym wyjściem nie byłoby *wsadzenie całej wojny do zamrażarki*? (2 II 2023)
> (67) Żadan *wpuszcza wojnę* do wierszy. (2 III 2022)

The first expression is non-specialized, as it does not impose any restrictions on the type of activity that one leads *prowadzi* 'conducts, carries on'. It can be any behaviour, an investigation, a database, a farm, psychotherapy, or any other activity. The second, third, fourth and fifth expressions are less different, since they all contain the characteristics that refer to phenomena that are evaluated more negatively. To illustrate, in addition to the war, one can unleash (*rozpętać*) a revolution, a storm (on the Internet), a brawl, a discussion, or a scandal. This is also true of the term ''high tension'' (*wysokie napięcie*), which is used metaphorically in a few cases to refer to a discussion, argument, or conflict.

It could be argued that sentence (66) provides the original definition of war. However, a similar metaphor is presented in another article in "Polityka" on a different subject:

> (68) Taka konstrukcja była też sprzeczna z zaproponowanymi przez niego przepisami, które dwa lata *zleżały się w sejmowej zamrażarce*. (15 XII 2022)

The same applies to sentence (67), which introduces the concept of war into poetry. In fact, the Internet offers another version of this metaphor:

(69) Adeyemi stworzyła zrozumiały nawet dla młodszych czytelników świat, *wpuszczając* jednocześnie *do powieści młodzieżowych powiew świeżości.*

It can, therefore, be concluded that there are no instances of metaphorical language in the researched material that can be considered unique to the context of war. Instead, metaphorical terms are used in a variety of contexts, frequently in constructions with a different collocations, such as a noun name for an event, action, process or state. This suggests that there are no grounds for claiming that there are any characteristic metaphorical models such as the idea that war is a living thing or that war is fun.

Conclusion

The following paragraphs will summarize the main findings of the research.

1. The grammatical structure of the majority of metaphorical constructions is based on verbs that present war as an active agent or cause, or also as an object of various kinds of action. A significant proportion of these contain the noun *wojna* in the nominative case, demonstrating the tendency to personalize war. This phenomenon reflects to some extent the helplessness of human beings in the face of war: there are few means to influence war, let alone prevent it. Consequently, the war begins, approaches, arrives, intensifies, disappears, transforms, and so forth.

2. The metaphorical nomination is related to the need to define quite a number of characteristics of war. In fact, every fourth metaphorical construction in the corpus contains another characteristic. Most frequently, the metaphor occurs when there is a need to nominate the war as a factor or condition of other events or states, as well as when there is a need to nominate the duration of the war. The analysis showed that all these characteristics are situated outside the core zone of the WAR concept, which consists of three slots: issue, purpose and participants). The peripheral characteristics were found to represent two categories: second and third order complements. The first category (duration, intensity, type, location, etc.) includes optional characteristics of war, while the second encompasses characteristics of bystanders whose status, condition or functioning is somehow or other related to war (e.g. observing war, alternative to war, similar to war, etc.).

3. A total of 38 of source domains were identified as being used for metaphorical nomination in the context of war. Of these four were found to be the most common: LIVING BEING – 23 constructions, MATERIAL OBJECT, THING (23 constructions), PERSON (19 constructions), ROOM, AREA – 8 constructions.

The evidence suggests a tendency to personify and objectify war. Metaphorical models of the type WAR IS FUN type do not constitute a category of the linguistic worldview, programming speech activity, as they concern a wider or, in the majority of cases, a narrower range of characteristics of the target domain that are necessary for lexicalization or phrasing.

4. The metaphors of war presented in journalistic texts on the war in Ukraine are conventionalized and largely unoriginal. Among the most common are expressions such as *scenariusz wojny* 'war scenario', *rozgrywać wojnę* 'war game', *zimna wojna* 'cold war', *wybuch wojny* 'outbreak of war' and , which are typically employed in a variety of discourses. In addition, the above metaphorical terms are also commonly used in relation to other actions or states, as well as to other conflicts.

The study explicitly shows that the linguistic, and in particular the metaphorical, nomination of war is extremely diverse. Therefore, it is difficult to claim (in the sense of linguistic determinism) that the existing patterns of linguistic nomination of war influence the awareness of language users and the mental conceptualization of war.

References

Abrams, M. H. (1960), The Correspondent Breeze. A Romantic Metaphor, [in:] Abrams, M. H. (ed.). English Romantic Poets. Modern Essays in Criticism. New York, 37-54.

Ahrens, K. | Burgers, C. | Zhong, Y. (2022), Evaluating the Influence of Metaphor in News on Foreign-Policy Support, [in:] International Journal of Communication 16, 4140-4163.

Brzoza-Kolorz, K. (2020), Rama konfliktu w opisie mediów masowych i polityki w okresie polskiej kampanii parlamentarnej 2015 w wybranych tygodnikach opinii, [in:] Politeja 64, 357-74.

Charteris-Black, J. (2004), Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis. New York.

Cserép, A. (2014), Conceptual Metaphor Theory: in defence or on the fence?, [in:] Argumentum 10, 261-288.

Dolińska, J. (2018), Zur Klassifizierung der Prädikative. Katowice.

Durkheim, É. (2007), Zasady metody społecznej. Warszawa.

Dvořák, P. (2012), Translating Metaphors within Political Discourse: The Case of EU [master's diploma thesis]. Brno.

Eriksson, I. (2019), Retaining or losing the conceptual metaphor A study on institutional translation of metaphors in political discourse from English into Swedish and Spanish. Stockholm.

Fabiszak, M. (2007), A Conceptual Metaphor approach to War Discourse and its Implications. Poznan.

Flusberg, S. J. | Matlock, T. | Thibodeau, P. H. (2018), War metaphors in public discourse, [in:] Metaphor and Symbol 33 (1), 1-18.

Gražytè, R. | Maskaliūnienè, N. (2009), Translation of Conceptual Metaphor in the Legal Discourse of EU White Papers [in:] Vertimo Studijos 2, 71-87.

Hanusch, N. (2014), From Words to War. Eine Analyse des metaphorischen Sprachgebrauchs internationaler Printmedien vor Ausbruch des Irakkrieges 2003, [in:] Journal for EuroLinguistiX 11, 44-50.

Harrington, K, J. (2012), The use of metaphor discourse about cancer: A review of the literature, [in:] Clinical Journal of Oncology Nursing 16 (4), 408.

Jäkel, O. (2002), Hypotheses revisited: The cognitive theory of metaphor applied to religious texts, [in:] Metaphorik.de 2 (1), 20-42.

Karlberg, M. | Buell, L. (2005), Deconstructing the 'war of all against all': The prevalence and implications of war metaphors and other adversarial news schema in TIME, Newsweek, and Maclean's, [in:] Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies 12 (1), 22-39.

Katz, A. | Law, A. (2010), Experimental support for conceptual metaphors with an episodic memory task, [in:] Metaphor and Symbol 25 (4), 263-270.

Keller, R. (1994), Sprachwandel. Von der unsichtbaren Hand in der Sprache. Tübingen | Basel.

Kiklewicz, A. (2006), Kognitywna teoria metafory – zagadnienia dyskusyjne, [in:] Przegląd Humanistyczny L (2), 29-45.

Kiklewicz, A. (2019), Metafory konceptualne: fenomeny umysłu czy konstrukty kognitywistyczne? Część 1, [in:] LingVaria XIV (2), 13-27.

Kiklewicz, A. (2020), Metafory konceptualne: fenomeny umysłu czy konstrukty kognitywistyczne? Część 2, [in:] LingVaria XV (1), 31-46.

Kiklewicz, A. (2022), Problem realności psychologicznej metafor konceptualnych, [in:] Prace Językoznawcze XXIV (4), 7-26.

Krennmayr, T. (2011), Metaphor in newspapers. Utrecht.

Lahlou, H. | Abdul Rahim, H. (2022), Conceptual metaphors in North African French-speaking news discourse about COVID-19, [in:] Indonesian Journal Of Applied Linguistics 11 (3), 589-600.

Lakoff, G. (1977), Linguistic Gestalts, [in:] Papers from the 13. Regional Meeting Chicago Linguistic Society. Chicago, 236-287.

Lakoff, G. (1992), Metaphor and war: The metaphor system used to justify war in the gulf, [in:] Pütz, M. (ed.), Thirty years of linguistic evolution: Studies in honour of Rene Dirven on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. Amsterdam, 463-481.

Lakoff, G. | Johnson, M. (1980), Metaphors We Live By. Chicago | London.

Leshchova, M. (2017), Leksicheskaja polisemija v kognitivnom aspekte. Moskva.

Lipowicz, E. (2015), Rola i znaczenie metafory w mediacjach narracyjnych, [in:] Dyskursy Młodych Andragogów 16, 91-100.

Lupton, D. (2012), Medicine as culture: Illness, disease and the body. Sage.

Maalej, Z. (2014), Doing critical discourse analysis with the contemporary theory of metaphor: towards a discourse model of metaphor, [in:] Hart, C. | Lukeš, D. (eds.), Cognitive linguistics in critical discourse studies: Application and theory. Cambridge, 132-158.

Mihas, E. (2005), Non-Literal Language in Political Discourse, [in:] Shields, R. (ed.), LSO Working Papers in Linguistics 5: Proceedings of WIGL. Madison, 124-139,

Miller, G. A. (1979), Images and Models, Similes and Metaphors, [in:] Ortony, A. (ed.), Metaphor and Thought. Cambridge | London | New York etc., 202-248.

Najjari, R. | Mohammadi, M. (2018), Metaphorical conceptualization of SPORT through TERRITORY as a vehicle, [in:] Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics 9 (1), 127-147.

Olechowska, P. (2018), Metadziennikarstwo – funkcje okładek tygodników społeczno-politycznych z 2016 roku w analizie multimodalnej, [in:] Hofman, I. | Kępa-Figura, D. (eds.), Współczesne media. Zagadnienia ogólne i teoretyczne. Multimodalność mediów drukowanych. Lublin, 119-150.

Pastucha-Blin, A. (2022), Wojna o ciało idealne Metaforyczna konceptualizacja jako jedna ze strategii perswazyjnych dyskursu, [in:] Polono-Italica Fabrica Litterarum 1 (4), 1-15.

Richards, I. A. (1950), The Philosophy of Rhetoric. Oxford.

Sontag, S. (1978), Illness as metaphor. Farrar.

Ullmann, S. (1964), Semantics. The Introduction in the Science of Meaning. Oxford.

Vervaeke, J. | Kennedy, J. (2004), Conceptual metaphor and abstract thought, [in:] Metaphor and symbol 19 (3), 213-231.

Völker, I. (2019), Totaler Krieg" durch Metaphern? Eine kognitiv-linguistische Untersuchung der Sportpalastrede von Goebbels im Hinblick auf die Verwendung und Bedeutung von konzeptuellen Metaphern nach Lakoff und Johnson, [in:] Mythos-Magazin: Politisches Framing 1, 1-40.

Werner, W. (2004), Wokół metafory wojny, [in:] Pro Libris. Lubuskie Pismo Literacko-Kulturalne 1 (6) 69-82.

Wicke, P. | Bolognesi, M. M. (2020), Framing COVID-19: How we conceptualize and discuss the pandemic on Twitter, [in:] PLOS ONE 15 (9), 1-24 .

Zvegincev, V. A. (1967), Teoreticheskaja i prikladnaja lingvistika. Moskva.

Żmudzka-Brodnicka, M. (2013), Wojna w dziennikarskim przekazie sportowym w ujęciu kognitywnej teorii metafory, [in:] Naukovi zapysky. Serija „Psikholohija i pedahohika" 24, 164-167.