



ФИЛОЛОГИЯ – PHILOLOGY

UDC 81'365:81'243+81'231(001)

IRSTI 16.41.21

DOI 10.37238/2960-1371.2960-138X.2026.101(1).6

Bashkatova Yulia A.

Kemerovo State University, Kemerovo, Russia

E-mail: stbua@mail.ru

SOMATIC METAPHORS OF WAR: COGNITIVE PATTERNS IN RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH- LANGUAGE MEDIA

Annotation. The study presents a comparative analysis of the conceptual metaphor *war is a human body* in Russian and English media discourse. Its relevance stems from the key role metaphors play in interpreting and emotionally perceiving military conflicts in the media. The aim is to identify universal and culture-specific features of this anthropomorphic model. Using data from the Russian National Corpus and the COCA corpus and applying the MIPVU procedure, the analysis reveals that, despite a common cognitive basis, the metaphor's realization differs. Russian discourse emphasizes concrete somatic images (*хребет, кровь, лицо*), highlighting structural stability and sacrifice. English discourse favors abstract concepts (*body politic, soul, lifeblood*), reflecting a systemic view of war. A common feature is the portrayal of war as a disease. The findings are significant for linguistics, political communication, and media literacy.

Keywords: conceptual metaphor, *war is a human body*, media discourse, anthropomorphization, cognitive linguistics, comparative analysis, MIPVU; somatic metaphors.

Introduction

In the context of modern dynamically transforming information space, characterized by high intensity of political and military conflicts, media discourse acquires the status of one of the key factors in shaping and regulating public consciousness. In the context of understanding complex abstract concepts, linguistic means are of particular importance, among which conceptual metaphors stand out, performing the functions of semantic interpretation and cognitive transmission.

Of particular interest for scientific analysis is the use of metaphorical modeling of conflict through the concept “*War is a human body*”. This approach allows not only to actualize the structural components of the conflict situation, but also to endow the discourse with emotionally charged semantics, contributing to a deeper perception of information.

A comparative study of the functioning of this metaphor in Russian and English media discourses opens up the possibility of identifying universal cognitive strategies for conceptualizing military events, as well as specific features determined by linguocultural characteristics of conflict field representation.

The theory of conceptual metaphor occupies an important place in cognitive linguistics, exploring how metaphors help to comprehend abstract concepts and complex phenomena [1, 2]. Particular attention is paid to metaphors related to war.

The representation of war in media discourse has a strong influence on its perception. News texts often use metaphors that highlight some aspects of the situation while hiding others. As researchers note, an effectively applied metaphor played a key role in the media coverage of the Gulf War: “*Without stereotypes and metaphors, it would have been much more difficult to convince the world of the inevitability of using real weapons – Tomahawks and cruise missiles – to force Iraq to comply with UN decisions*” [3, p. 302].

The purpose of this work is a comparative analysis of the conceptual metaphor “*War is a human body*” in Russian and English media discourses. Within this analysis, it is planned to identify both common cognitive models and specific linguocultural features of this metaphor's functioning.

Materials and Methods

Linguist Julian Jaynes was one of the first to consider metaphor as a key element of the cognitive system and evolution of consciousness [4]. His ideas were developed in the works of linguists of the 1970s–1980s, including A. Healey and R. Harris, among others [5, p. 22]. However, the most coherent formulation of the theory of conceptual metaphor belongs to George Lakoff and Mark Johnson [6], which, despite criticism (for example,



from Geoffrey Murphy [7, p. 99]), had a significant impact on further research and contributed to the emergence of new approaches such as blending theory, primary metaphor theory, and others [8, p. 77].

Modern works, both by Russian scholars (E. V. Budaev, A. P. Chudinov [9, p. 10]) and foreign researchers, continue to explore conceptual metaphors, increasingly calling for the integration of existing theories into more comprehensive models.

Jonathan Charteris-Black, studying metaphors in corpus linguistics, emphasized that «it is advantageous to compare the results of analyzing a subject-specific corpus with the results of a general corpus. In this case, the general corpus serves as a kind of reference» [10, p. 31]. The scholar also provides clarifications to the methodology of conceptual metaphor analysis: qualitative analysis of metaphors is complemented by quantitative analysis of their frequency of use. Conducting such an analysis became possible thanks to the compilation of language corpora.

The study also employs the Metaphor Identification Procedure Vrije Universiteit (MIPVU) method [11] for identifying metaphorically used words and phrases; contextual analysis to clarify the semantics of metaphorical combinations and their contextual connections; qualitative analysis; and certain techniques of statistical analysis to identify the frequency of metaphorical expressions, as well as a discursive approach [12].

To achieve the objectives of this study, data from two language corpora were utilized: the Russian National Corpus (RNC) and the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). These corpora were selected as the most representative sources of modern media discourse in Russian and English, respectively.

The Russian National Corpus (RNC) includes materials from newspapers, magazines, online publications, television, interviews, and official documents. The analysis used texts from 2014 to 2023, covering the period of active coverage of military-political conflicts (Crimean crisis, Syrian campaign, events in Ukraine). The total volume of the RNC is approximately 250 million words, but a thematic sample on the topic of war and conflicts was selected for the study.

The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) consists of publications from American media, academic sources, as well as news transcripts and online materials. The analysis covered data from 2010 to 2022, including coverage of the operation in Afghanistan, US involvement in Syria and Iraq, and the initial stage of the Ukrainian crisis. The total volume of COCA exceeds 600 million words; a subsample related to the topic of war was selected for the study.

The following search queries were used to form the sample:

In Russian: «война» (war), «конфликт» (conflict), «военные действия» (military actions), «терроризм» (terrorism), «войска» (troops), «армия» (army), «жертва войны» (victim of war), «пострадавшие» (victims), «миротворцы» (peacekeepers), «интервенция» (intervention).

In English: «war», «conflict», «military operation», «terrorism», «troops», «army», «casualties», «victims», «peace keeping», «intervention».

Texts were selected based on the following criteria:

- Belonging to media discourse (journalism, news)
- Thematic connection with military or political conflicts
- Representativeness of the source (major media outlets, authoritative publications)
- Availability of context for qualitative metaphor analysis

The search for metaphorical expressions was conducted using software tools available in the interface of each corpus (advanced search with morphological filtering and date/topic restrictions). After the initial selection of texts, manual contextual analysis was applied using the MIPVU procedure.

Research Results

Conceptual metaphors play a significant role in understanding war by transforming abstract phenomena into accessible images. In media discourse, they not only convey information but also shape public opinion, making their analysis essential for studying linguistic and ideological processes.

Bodily Metaphorization is one of the key mechanisms of conceptual thinking. Despite cultural differences, bodily metaphors (e.g., *the heart of the nation*, *the face of power*) are widely represented in different languages, emphasizing their cognitive nature.

Since war is distant from the everyday experience of most people, it is often conceptualized through bodily images: *wounds of war*, *heart of the conflict*, *shed blood*. These metaphors enhance the emotional impact of narratives, form images of victims, heroes, and aggressors, and influence public attitudes toward military actions.

Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIPVU)

Conceptualizing complex and abstract phenomena like war often requires the use of figurative language. One of the most reliable tools for systematic metaphor identification in texts is the MIPVU (Metaphor



Identification Procedure (Vrije Universiteit) method. This procedure, developed at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, offers a clear four-step algorithm:

1. Contextual Immersion: The text is read in its entirety to understand the general meaning and theme.
2. Lexical Unit Identification: Individual words or phrases are identified for analysis.
3. Meaning Comparison for Each Unit:
 - o Contextual Meaning: The word's meaning within the text is established.
 - o Basic Meaning: The primary, physical, or concrete meaning of the word is determined.
 - o Comparison and Identification: If the contextual and basic meanings differ but are connected through a similarity relationship, the unit is marked as metaphorical.
4. Filtering: It is checked whether the word is a proper noun or a case of polysemy within the same semantic domain, which would exclude it from the metaphor category.

The analysis of Russian media texts on war using the MIPVU method revealed stable patterns of anthropomorphic metaphors that attribute human features or body parts to war. Let's consider the key groups:

«Хребет войны»

Examples: «сломили хребет оппозиции», «переломила хребет терроризму», «война переломилась – хрустнула по хребту».

«Ценой огромных потерь Советская Армия, весь советский народ выиграли жесточайшую войну, переломили хребет фашизму».¹

Token: *хребет* (spine, backbone)

Contextual Meaning: foundation, structural support, enemy's strength

Basic Meaning: anatomical spine as body support

Comparison: transfer of physical support properties (spine) to abstract support (ideology, military power)

– metaphor

Basis: similarity in structural significance and vulnerability (just as a broken spine leads to the collapse of the body, breaking the enemy's "хребет" (spine) leads to their defeat)

«Сердце войны»

Examples: «в самом сердце войны», «в самое сердце России вонзили нож гражданской войны».

«Отвечая на вопрос о том, с какими сложностями сталкивается организация во взаимодействии с государствами, глава МККК ответил, что, по его мнению, главная проблема заключается в том, что Красный Крест работает в очень сложных точках, большинство из которых «находятся в самом сердце войны»²

Token: *сердце* (heart).

Contextual meaning: epicenter, central zone, place of greatest intensity or importance of a conflict.

Basic meaning: vital organ, central organ of blood circulation.

Comparison: Transfer of the property of being a central life-sustaining point to a geographical or conceptual center of military action. Metaphor.

Grounds: similarity in functional centrality and vital importance.

"Кровь войны"

Examples: «среди снегов и крови гражданской войны», «опаленных кровью четырех лет войны», «дать обем сторонам истечь кровью», «нефть – это кровь войны». «АиФ» своими глазами увидел, какие настроения царят на земле, политой кровью междоусобной войны и готовой вновь любой ценой отстаивать свою независимость от Грузии.³

Token: *кровь* (blood).

Contextual meaning: casualties, violence, suffering, death (in most examples). A vital resource, "fuel" of conflict (in the example with oil).

Basic meaning: biological fluid that sustains life.

Comparison: Casualties: transfer of the property of vital force (blood as a symbol of life) to its loss (death, suffering). Metaphor. Resource: transfer of the property of vital necessity (blood for the organism) to strategic necessity (resources for war). Metaphor.

Grounds: similarity in life-sustaining function (blood sustains the body, resources sustain war) and symbolism of loss/sacrifice.

"Руки войны"

¹ Национальный корпус русского языка (ruscorpora.ru)

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.



Examples: «развязывают руки «партии войны», «играет на руку интегральной партии войны», «готовности повоевать чужими руками».

«Также в министерстве отметили, что новый закон «перечеркивает» минские соглашения и «развязывают руки «партии войны»»⁴.

Token: руки (hands).

Contextual meaning: freedom of action, ability to influence, instrument, proxy.

Basic meaning: part of the body for manipulating objects and affecting the world.

Comparison: transfer of the function of a physical instrument of influence to an abstract opportunity to act or use others. Metaphor.

Grounds: similarity in the function of exerting influence, control, and manipulation.

"Face of war": Essence and Visage

Examples: «у войны – не женское лицо», «у войны – не детское лицо». «Потому что маленькая Анна с огромными глазами-впадинами на худом лице – взрослая (у войны – не детское лицо)».⁵

Token: лицо (face).

Contextual meaning: essence, character, true nature, visible side of a phenomenon.

Basic meaning: front part of a human head, bearing individual features.

Comparison: transfer of the property of external appearance and identity to an abstract representation of the essence of war. Metaphor.

Grounds: Similarity in representation (a face reflects personality/condition, the "face of war" reflects its essence).

Other anthropomorphic metaphors:

"Head of war": «фашист опять поднимет голову» – head as a symbol of the threat's revival (basic meaning – part of the body).

"War breathing down one's neck": «Третья мировая война ... дышит нам в затылок» – *breathing* as an image of an immediate and tangibly approaching threat (basic meaning – physiological process).

"War is a disease": «выжигающее вирус войны», «волдыри войны вздуваются на теле Африки» – virus, blisters as metaphors for the destructive, contagious, and painful nature of conflict.

"Dead war": «Война мертва лишь для молодых», «настоящее лицо войны – мертвое» – *dead* as a metaphor for losing relevance for some, while retaining traumatic impact and a non-living essence for others.

Let's look at examples of the use of the metaphor *war is a human body* in English-language media discourse:

"Heart" or "soul" of a nation

Examples: *"the heart or soul of a nation being endangered during a war."*

"Peasants who have returned to their lands in the heart of El Salvador's war zone are celebrating the first anniversary of a daring experiment".⁶

Token: heart/soul.

Contextual meaning: the most important, vulnerable entity, identity, the lifeblood of a nation.

Basic meaning: Heart: The central vital organ of blood circulation. Soul: An immaterial entity, spirit, consciousness (often associated with life).

Comparison: transferring the property of vital importance and centrality (organ/spirit) to the abstract essence of the nation.

Grounds: similarity in vital necessity, vulnerability, and central importance to the existence of the whole. A metaphor.

"Lifeblood" of a military unit

Examples: *"the lifeblood of a military unit being vital to its success."*

"War is a flesh and blood thing; even in Europe' the military balance' does not purge it of its political character".⁷

Token: blood.

Contextual meaning: absolutely necessary resources (human, material, moral) for the functioning and survival of the unit.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶COCA (<https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>)

⁷Ibid.



Basic meaning is blood as a biological fluid that is absolutely necessary to maintain the life of the body.
Comparison: transfer of the property of an absolute vital necessity (biological fluid) to the abstract/concrete resources of the army.

Grounds: The similarity in the fundamental role for maintaining the "life" (functioning) and success of the system. A metaphor.

“Toothless” justice system

Examples: *“the international justice system is seen as toothless.”*

*“When this act was debated, many doubted whether it would achieve its dual purpose of curbing presidents and giving teeth to the constitutional war power of Congress”.*⁸

Token: tooth/teeth

Contextual meaning: unable to act effectively, intimidate, punish, or defend; powerless.

Basic meaning: toothless; unable to bite, chew, defend or attack physically.

Comparison: transfer of the property of physical inability to act / defend (due to the lack of tools – teeth) to the functional inability of the system.

Grounds: the similarity is in the absence of the necessary "tools" to perform its main aggressive/defensive function.

“War is a disease”

Examples: *‘plague of war’, ‘war is a cancer’, ‘the disease of war’.*

*“The violence in Ukraine is infectious, spreading like a disease and threatening to engulf the entire region in a spiral of destruction”.*⁹

Token: infection/disease

Contextual meaning: The conflict is characterized as uncontrollably spreading, destructive, and pathogenic to society.

Basic meaning: Infectious: capable of being transmitted from one organism to another, causing disease.

Disease: a violation of the normal state of the body, causing dysfunction.

Comparison: transfer of the properties of contagiousness, pathogenicity, disruption of normal functioning and destructiveness (disease) to the phenomenon of war/violence.

Grounds: the similarity in the ability to spread uncontrollably, damage the "organism" (society) and disrupt its normal "life".

Confirmation of the concept of war is human body: all the analyzed examples are unequivocally confirmed by MIPVU as metaphors based on the transfer of properties from the human/biological body (heart, soul, blood, teeth) or biological processes/states (disease, infection, treatment) to abstract or large-scale concepts related to war (nation, military unit, the justice system, the conflict itself, humanitarian aid).

Somatic (bodily) metaphors and metaphors of illness dominate in both languages. English discourse more often uses the concepts of soul, lifeblood, disease/infectious and body politic. In the examples given earlier, Russian discourse placed more emphasis on specific parts of the body as a structure/support (*spine*), a source of suffering (*blood*), an instrument (*hands*) and an entity (*face*), as well as on anthropomorphism (*war breathes*). Both languages actively use the metaphor of illness.

To test the hypothesis of the dominance of the conceptual metaphor war is human body and its subtypes in Russian and English-language media discourse, as well as to identify cultural and linguistic differences, a quantitative analysis of the frequency of use of the corresponding metaphorical expressions was carried out (Table 1). This section presents the results based on data from the NCRA (Russian corpus) and COCA (English corpus). The number of selected texts is 187 in Russian and 154 in English. Examples of metaphors of war is the human body have been identified: 234 (Russian) and 198 (English); the number of unique metaphorical patterns: 28 (Russian) and 25 (English). Thus, in both languages, the conceptual metaphor *Война это тело человека/ War is a human body* is presented quite often: on average, 1.25 examples per text in Russian discourse and 1.29 examples per text in English.

Table 1 – Comparison of the frequency of metaphors of *War is a human body* in Russian and English

Metaphorcategory	Russian (%)	English (%)
Metaphors of specific body parts (spine, face, blood)	46.2	18.7

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid.



Metaphors of disease (virus of war, wounds of war)	23.5	33.3
Biological processes (respiration, death))	18.0	18.2
Abstract concepts (body political, soul, lifeblood)	12.3	29.8

The study of the conceptual metaphor *Война это тело человека / War is a human body* in Russian and English-language media discourse confirms its important role in shaping public perception of military conflicts. Metaphor acts as a linguistic tool and as a cognitive mechanism that makes abstract and complex things understandable and emotionally meaningful. An analysis using the MIPVU methodology showed that anthropomorphic and somatic metaphors are widely represented in the media of both linguistic spaces.

A common feature of Russian and English media discourse is the use of disease metaphors (*the virus of war, the wounds of war*), as well as the emphasis on the body as a symbol of suffering, strength, vulnerability, and structure. At the same time, specific body parts (*spine, blood, face*) are more often used in Russian, while more abstract concepts (body political, soul, lifeblood) dominate in English.

The revealed differences in the use of metaphors of war is a human body in Russian-speaking and English-speaking media discourse are not accidental – they reflect the deep cultural, historical and ideological features of the respective linguistic communities. While both languages actively use the bodily metaphorization of war, each of them emphasizes different aspects of the human body, which indicates a difference in the conceptualization of conflict and its role in society.

In Russian media discourse, the metaphors "*to break the backbone of terrorism*" and "*to break the backbone of the enemy*" are often found. The ridge symbolizes the support and structural strength of the system, and in a military context, the strategic suppression of a key element of resistance. This choice of metaphor is related to the historical experience of Russia: Victory in the Great Patriotic War is perceived as the result of the destruction of the foundations of the fascist system – ideological and military [13, 14]. This strengthened the link between the elimination of the "pillar" of the enemy and the decisive success.

Blood acts as a powerful metaphor for sacrifice and pain, giving the war the character of a sacred mission [15, 16]. In Russian culture, this is associated with the tradition of self-sacrifice, from the Orthodox ideal of suffering to the heroic image of the Great Patriotic War. The concept of "*blood for the Motherland*" has taken root in literature, cinema and textbooks, forming the image of collective duty and heroism [17]. Symbolically, blood becomes a cultural code denoting belonging to the people, the price of freedom and honor [18], and plays an important role in building national discourse and preserving historical memory.

The face acts as the symbolic essence of war, revealing its deeply human dimension. Svetlana Alexievich's famous phrase, "*War does not have a feminine face,*" illustrates how in Russian cultural discourse, war is endowed with individuality, emotional coloring, and even moral character [19]. This phenomenon is associated with an anthropocentric approach to the topic of war, which is rooted in Russian literature and journalism. Researchers note that Russian culture retains the tradition of perceiving war through the prism of personal suffering and the fate of specific people, which enhances the emotional impact on the audience [20, 21].

Abstract concepts such as body politic, soul, and lifeblood are more common in English media discourse. "*The heart of the nation is in danger*", "*The soul of democracy must be protected*" – such expressions are found in English-language media discourse more often than their counterparts in Russian. This is due to the deeply rooted tradition of using biological metaphors in the political language of Anglo-Saxon countries [10, 22].

The *body politic* concept dates back to medieval political thought and the development of the state-organizational model, according to which the state is considered as a living organism in need of health, protection and treatment. This metaphor was actively used in the works of Aristotle, and later developed in the treatises of Thomas Aquinas and other medieval philosophers [24].

In modern English-language political and military discourse, the metaphor of "*the soul of the nation*" refers to spiritual essence, moral values, and national identity. Its origin is connected with the Christian tradition, where the soul is understood as an immortal immaterial entity, which formed the basis of secular rhetoric about the protection of values [25]. Cartesian dualism, which contrasts the material and the spiritual, also played an important role. This division is reflected in the language and culture of the West, as shown by the research of J. Lakoff and M. Johnson [6], as well as other scientists [26, 27]. Compared to Russian culture, where the spiritual and the physical are often perceived as a single whole, the Western tradition places more emphasis on their distinction. These differences are related to linguistic and cultural features and the theory of linguistic relativity.



The metaphor of lifeblood in Western political and media discourse refers to resources critical to war, from oil to personnel. Its use highlights the structural dependence of military systems and is associated with three key trends: functionalism, economization, and technologization.

Functionalism sees war as a system where each element fulfills its role. The lifeblood metaphor emphasizes the importance of key components for its integrity. The economization of war links military action with investment and efficiency, legitimizing the need for constant resource investments. Technologization extends the concept of vital resources to data, cybersecurity, and communications, influencing the symbolic representation of war.

Conclusions and Research Perspectives

Thus, the differences in the implementation of the *War is a human body* metaphor in Russian and English cannot be reduced to stylistic preferences. They have deep cultural, historical, and discursive roots. The Russian language emphasizes bodily pain, structural stability, and personal experience of war, while the English language tends toward abstraction, systemic thinking, and symbolization of war as a social phenomenon.

This research opens up prospects for analyzing the influence of conceptual metaphors on the formation of public opinion, especially in the context of digital media and social networks characterized by high speed of information dissemination and emotional intensity.

The conceptual metaphor *War is a human body* performs an important integrative function in media discourse, providing a comparison of cognitive models of different cultures while simultaneously reflecting their linguocultural specifics. The analysis of this metaphor contributes to a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of verbal influence and the processes of constructing collective perceptions of war within the modern information space.

REFERENCES

- [1] Petiy Natalia. Conceptual metaphors verbalizing war in Ukraine in media discourse. *Věda a perspektivy*. 2023. № 2(21). DOI: 10.52058/2695-1592-2023-2(21)-203-214. [In English]
- [2] Fabiszak Malgorzata. A conceptual metaphor approach to war discourse and its implications: Dissertation. Poznan: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2007. 270 p. [In English]
- [3] Sandikcioglu Esra. More metaphorical warfare in the Gulf: Orientalist frames in news coverage. *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003. P. 299-320. [In English]
- [4] Jaynes J. The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind. Boston; New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2000. P. 84-100. [In English]
- [5] Akimtseva, Yu.V. The locus of conceptual metaphor. *Philological Sciences. Questions of theory and practice*. 2015. No. 11 (53), part 3. pp. 21-24. EDN UMMJJH. [In Russian]
- [6] Lakoff George. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1981. XIII, 242 p. [In English]
- [7] Murphy Gregory L. Reasons to doubt the present evidence for metaphoric representation. *Cognition*. 1997. Vol. 62. P. 99-108. [In English]
- [8] Novitskaya I. V. Theory of conceptual metaphor and the development of alternative concepts in the framework of the cognitive field of metaphorology (based on the materials of modern English studies). *Language and Culture*. 2019. No. 46. pp. 76-101. DOI:10.17223/19996195/46/5. [In Russian]
- [9] Budaev E. V. Fundamentals of cognitive-discursive analysis of political metaphor: monograph. Nizhny Tagil: Nizhny Tagil State Socio-Pedagogical Academy, 2012. 280 p. [In Russian]
- [10] Charteris-Black J. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. 200 p. [In English]
- [11] Steen Gerard. A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification: From MIP to MIPVU / Gerard Steen, Lettie Dorst, J. Berenike Herrmann, Anna Kaal. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010. DOI:10.1075/celcr.14.[In English]
- [12] Shitikov P. M. The role of corpus research in the study of metaphor. *Kazan Bulletin of Young Scientists. Pedagogical sciences. Theoretical and practical issues of modern linguistics*. 2018. Vol. 2, No. 4 (7). [In Russian]
- [13] Asad T. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003. 320 p. [In English]
- [14] Akhiezer, A. S. *Russia: criticism of historical experience. (Sociocultural dynamics of Russia) / A. S. Akhiezer; edited by I. A. Besedin*. 2nd ed., reprint. Novosibirsk: Siberian Chronograph, 1997. Volume 1: From the Past to the Future. 1997. 804 p. ISBN 5-87550-039-5 [In Russian]



- [15] Melnikova A.R. Kotlyarova O.A. The specifics of the formation of historical memory of the Great Patriotic War as a phenomenon of socio-cultural space. *Bulletin of the Taganrog Chekhov Institute*. 2024. 1. 142-146. [In Russian]
- [16] Sokolova I.V. Modern military prose in Russian literature: a textbook. Vladivostok: Publishing House of the Far Eastern Federal University, 2021. 75 p. [In Russian]
- [17] Ivanova T. N. School textbook and historical memory: an analysis of Russian educational literature on history in the XX century. "West-East". Scientific and practical yearbook. 2020.13, 99-114. DOI: 10.30914/2227-6874-2020-13-99-114. [In Russian]
- [18] Kozhurin A.Ya. Blood and order (symbolic functions of blood in the history of human communities). *Journal of Integrative Cultural Studies*, vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 5-16. <https://www.doi.org/10.33910/2687-1262-2023-5-1-5-16> EDN PAIFAS. [In Russian]
- [19] Alexievich S. War doesn't have a woman's face. Minsk: Literature and Art, 1985; reprint 2013. 320 p. [In Russian]
- [20] Moiseeva V.G. The words "Great" and "Simple" about the Great Patriotic War: on the evolution of Russian "Military" prose of the second half of the twentieth century. *Bulletin of the Moscow University*. 2015. Series 9. Philology 3, 58-72. [In Russian]
- [21] Tikhonova N. Ethics of suffering: the representation of war in the light of humanistic values // *Sociological Journal*. 2021. Vol. 27, No. 4. pp.102-119. [In Russian]
- [22] Musolff A. Metaphor and Political Discourse: Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. 240 p. [In English]
- [23] Skinner Q. The Foundations of Modern Political Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978. 360 p. [In English]
- [25] McIntyre A. After virtue: Studies of the theory of morality M.: Academic Project; Yekaterinburg: Business Book, 2000. 384s.
- [26] Kövecses Zoltán. Metaphor: A Practical Introduction. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015. 242 p.
- [27] Gibbs Raymond W. Embodiment and Cognitive Science. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 431 p.

Башкатова Ю.А.

ТЕЛЕСНЫЕ МЕТАФОРЫ ВОЙНЫ: КОГНИТИВНЫЕ МОДЕЛИ В РУССКОМ И АНГЛИЙСКОМ МЕДИАДИСКУРСЕ

Аннотация. Исследование посвящено сравнительному анализу концептуальной метафоры *война – это тело человека* в русском и англоязычном медиадискурсе. Актуальность работы обусловлена ключевой ролью метафор в осмыслении и эмоциональном восприятии военных конфликтов в медиа. Цель – выявить универсальные и культурно-специфические черты данной антропоморфной модели. На материале Национального корпуса русского языка и корпуса СОСА с применением методики MIPVU показано, что, несмотря на общую когнитивную основу, реализация метафоры различается. Русский дискурс тяготеет к конкретным соматическим образам («хребет», «кровь», «лицо»), подчеркивая структурность и жертвенность. Английский – к абстрактным концептам (*body politic, soul, lifeblood*), отражая системный взгляд на войну. Общей чертой является образ войны как болезни. Результаты значимы для лингвистики, политической коммуникации и медиаграмотности.

Ключевые слова: концептуальная метафора; *война – это тело человека*; медиадискурс; антропоморфизация; когнитивная лингвистика; сравнительный анализ; MIPVU; соматические метафоры.

Башкатова Ю.А.

СОҒЫСТЫҢ ДЕНЕ МЕТАФОРАСЫ: ОРЫС ЖӘНЕ АҒЫЛШЫН МЕДИАДИСКУРСЫНДАҒЫ КОГНИТИВТІК МОДЕЛЬДЕР

Андатпа. Зерттеу соғыс тұжырымдамалық метафорасының салыстырмалы талдауына арналған - бұл орыс және ағылшын тілді медиадискурстағы адамның денесі. Жұмыстың өзектілігі медиадағы әскери жанжалдарды ойлау мен эмоциялық қабылдаудағы метафоралардың негізгі рөліне негізделген. Мақсаты - осы антропоморфты модельдің әмбебап және мәдени-ерекше ерекшеліктерін анықтау. Орыс тілінің ұлттық корпусының және MIPVU әдістемесін қолдана отырып, СОСА корпусының материалында жалпы когнитивтік негізге қарамастан, метафораның іске асырылуы ерекшеленетіні көрсетілген. Орыс дискурсы құрылымдылығы мен құрбандығын баса көрсете отырып, нақты соматикалық бейнелерге («жота», «қан», «бет») тартылады. Ағылшын тілі - абстрактілі ұғымдарға (*body politic, soul, lifeblood*), соғысқа жүйелі көзқарасты бейнелейді. Соғыстың ауру ретіндегі бейнесі ортақ белгі болып табылады. Нәтижелер лингвистика, саяси коммуникация және медиа сауаттылық үшін маңызды.



Кілт сөздер: тұжырымдамалық метафора; соғыс - бұл адамның денесі; медиадискурс; антропоморфизация; когнитивтік лингвистика; салыстырмалы талдау; MIPVU; соматикалық метафоралар.