

## I. KALBOTYRA

### *Liudmila Arcimavičienė*

Vilnius University

Institute of Foreign Languages

Universiteto g. 5, LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania

Tel.: +370 615 373 59

E-mail: [liudmila.arcimaviciene@gmail.com](mailto:liudmila.arcimaviciene@gmail.com)

Research interests: cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphor, media political discourse analysis, political philosophy

## TERRORISM IN MEDIA POLITICAL DISCOURSE: FROM METAPHORICAL EXPRESSIONS TO COGNITIVE MODELS

---

*This study aims at analysing metaphorical expressions and reconstructing TERRORISM metaphors in British and Lithuanian media political discourse in the theoretical framework of cognitive linguistics and political philosophy (Lakoff and Johnson 1999, Johnson 1993, Elshtain 2004, Fairclough 2001, Spencer 2006, Turner 2002, etc.). For that purpose, thirty-six analytical articles, searched by the key word 'terrorism (En.) / terorizmas (Lith.)' were collected from the online archives of The Economist and [www.politika.lt](http://www.politika.lt). The method applied to investigate the collected data is that of qualitative analysis in the theoretical framework of cognitive linguistics and conceptual metaphor theory (Чудунов 2001, Fauconnier and Turner 2002, Kövecses 2002, Lakoff 2001, 2002, etc.). The findings reveal that despite different time patterns of the collected data sources (i. e. English 2010; Lithuanian 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008) the analogous metaphors of WAR, CRIME and HEALTH have been reconstructed. Their analysis shows the prevalence of pragmatic political morality to TERRORISM governed by the concepts of STRENGTH, ORDER and CONTROL. Even more, their use spreads fear of terrorism by exploiting the image of terrifying war scenes, serious criminal activities and the deadly virus rapidly contaminating social order.*

KEY WORDS: media political discourse, terrorism, metaphorical linguistic expressions, conceptual metaphor, pragmatic politics.

---

### **Ambiguity of the term 'terrorism': historical analogy**

The concept of *terrorism* is notorious for its ambiguous use among governments or academic analysts. Independently of the context, it is almost invariably used in a pejorative sense with reference to *describing life-threatening actions perpetrated by*

*politically motivated self-appointed sub-state groups* (McClean and McMillan 1996, p. 532). However, it should be noted that the pejorative sense of terrorism is lost when the afore-mentioned life-threatening actions are carried out on behalf of a widely approved cause. On that occasion, the term 'terrorism' is generally avoided and substituted by other words bearing more positive

connotations such as *revolution*, *rebellion*, *upheaval* or *strike*.

Moreover, it should be noted that the terms 'revolution' and 'terrorism' are historically bounded thus inter-related. The political meaning of the former dates back to the late 15<sup>th</sup> century, derived from French, and was especially applied to the expulsion of Stuart dynasty under James II in 1688 and transfer of sovereignty to William and Mary (McClean and McMillan 1996, Halsall 1997). The latter was first used in 1795 in the specific sense of government intimidation during the reign of terror in France. This historical evidence accounts for the fact of political ambiguity in using the term 'terrorism'.

To avoid this ambiguity, Jean Bethke Elshstain offers to get the distinctions right as required by the 'democratic argument' (2004, p. 9–13). The ambiguity of the term 'terrorism' can be explained by the invariance of human perspectives: what is seen as the fight for freedom by one person, might be interpreted as an act of nihilism by another. Moreover, the ambiguity of this abstract concept can be explained by its contextual and metaphorical contingency, as context is very much determined by metaphors<sup>1</sup>.

## Metaphors of TERROR

The analysis of TERROR metaphors allows to perceive cultural symbols and the

system of moral expectations underlying political decision-making, foreign policy in particular. In his paper *Metaphors of Terror*, George Lakoff argues that the former US president Bush's administration declarations of 'war on terror' were governed by conservative morality. In its view, war on terror is perceived as a fight between Good and Evil, in which 'lesser evils' are tolerated and seen as necessary and expected (2001, p. 7). Even more, such conservative morality allows politicians to make any decisions in the name of national security. Metaphors representing the conservative morality can be grouped under the heading of Pragmatic Moral Politics (Arcimavičienė 2010). If pragmatic politics prevails, terrorism will not end and even 'turn its back on us' (Lakoff 2001, p. 8). The pragmatic approach is linguistically supported by two metaphorical groups: MILITARY (i. e. WAR) and BUSINESS (i. e. SELF-INTEREST).

Besides MILITARY and BUSINESS metaphors underlying terrorism discourse, Alexander Spencer suggests a metaphorical shift of perspective from WAR to CRIME (2006 a). This shift has transformed Al-Qaeda from an external to an internal threat, which has entailed a shift in counter-terrorism practices from a military to judicial response (Ibid. 2006 a). Spencer also maintains the position that terrorism exists in dependence to our subjective understandings and culture (2006 b).

The present study *aims* at analysing metaphorical linguistic expressions related to TERRORISM in British and Lithuanian media political discourse and reconstructing morality models and expectations governing British and Lithuanian political decision-making as related to TERRORISM. Media

<sup>1</sup> In cognitive linguistics, metaphor is seen as an effective tool of cultural and social popularization, as its use offers perspectives on different issues such as economics, politics, philosophy, education, mathematics, biotechnology, emotions (Turner 2002, Lakoff and Johnson 1999, Hellsten 2002, Spencer 2006, Kövecses 2002 etc.). These perspectives have wide social, political and moral implications, which derive from metaphorisation based on conflated social and cultural experiences.

political discourse has been selected with an intention to analyse political and social perceptions of TERRORISM from the perspective of British and Lithuanian journalists. Moreover, by analysing media political discourse power-language relationship is restored and evidence for power-holders' ideology is provided. As noted by Fairclough, by analysing media political discourse 'media power relations between power-holders and

the mass of the population' are discerned (2001, p. 43).

All this considered the following *research questions* have been raised:

1. How is TERRORISM perceived in British and Lithuanian media political discourse?
2. Which metaphorical linguistic expressions are associated with the concept of terrorism?

ENGLISH data / www.economist.com A	LITHUANIAN data / www.politika.lt B
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The bombs that stopped the happy talk (28 January 2010).</li> <li>2. Leviathan stirs again (21 January 2010).</li> <li>3. Bombs and baksheesh (21 January 2010).</li> <li>4. You can't fight in here, this is the war room (21 January 2010).</li> <li>5. Stop stop and search (14 January 2010).</li> <li>6. Okinaw-or-neva (14 January 2010).</li> <li>7. A deadly game (11 January 2010).</li> <li>8. Another war president, after all (7 January 2010).</li> <li>9. Integrated, but irked (7 January, 2010).</li> <li>10. Brown's way forward (22 February 2010).</li> <li>11. The week ahead (21 February 2010).</li> <li>12. On a short fuse (18 February 2010).</li> <li>13. The war over a military spending (4 February 2010).</li> <li>14. Yemen's local and global terrorism (4 November 2010).</li> <li>15. Air freight and counter-terrorism (4 November 2010).</li> <li>16. Bomb-making for beginners (4 November 2010).</li> <li>17. Terror and dissent (4 November 2010).</li> <li>18. Cop killers (4 November 2010).</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. JAV prezidentas pavadino Iraną pagrindiniu terorizmo rėmėju (14 January 2008).</li> <li>2. 7 proc. musulmonų nesmerkia rugsėjo 11-osios išpuolių JAV (27 February 2008).</li> <li>3. JAV žada teisingą teismą rugsėjo 11-osios išpuolių šalyje organizavimu įtariamiesiems kaliniams (12 February 2008).</li> <li>4. "Al Qaeda" Irake apmoko ir vaikus (7 February 2008).</li> <li>5. H. Kazlauskas. Terorizmas ir lyčių lygybė (14 November 2008).</li> <li>6. Europos Sąjunga aiškina teroristams, kodėl jie įtraukti į "juodąjį sąrašą" (23 April 2007).</li> <li>7. Su terorizmu susijusiems asmenims – sankcijos (1 February 2007).</li> <li>8. P. Gražulis nenori kovoti su terorizmu (1 February 2007).</li> <li>9. Terorizmas ant Lietuvos slenksčio (11 August 2006).</li> <li>10. Sprogimų aidas vijosi turistus iš Lietuvos (11 November 2005).</li> <li>11. Į "karštuosius" taškus vykstantiems turistams rekomenduojama imtis atsargumo priemonių (5 August 2005).</li> <li>12. Landsbergiui nerimą kelia Rusijos vykdomas valstybinis terorizmas (28 July 2005).</li> <li>13. Lietuva smerkia teroristinius išpuolius Londone ir solidarizuojasi su Jungtine Karalyste (8 July 2005).</li> <li>14. Turkijos likimas – nenusipėjamas (7 October 2005).</li> <li>15. Terorizmas ir valstybinis terorizmas (25 July 2005).</li> <li>16. Terorizmas nėra islamiškas (9 August 2005).</li> <li>17. Teroro aktai: radikalaus islamo pergale ar pralaimėjimas? (28 July 2005).</li> <li>18. Teroristai vis atviriau pareiškia apie savo ketinimus valdyti pasaulį (25 July 2005).</li> </ol>

Table 1: Data sources

3. On the basis of reconstructed conceptual metaphors, which political and moral perceptions of TERRORISM can be discerned?

To provide answers to these questions, the following *data sources* were accessed and the following articles searched by the key word *terrorism* were collected (Table 1).

Metaphorical expressions were selected from the sources indicated in the table above. The English data, collected from The Economist online, is cited 'A' in the paper. The Lithuanian data, derived from the website [www.politika.lt](http://www.politika.lt), is cited 'B' in the paper, where the most recent eighteen articles were retrieved by the key word 'terrorism (En.)/ terorizmas (Lith.)' and sorted by date. Thus, by citing the above sources, the following principle is upheld: [DATE SOURCE\_ARTICLE]. For instance, [A: 1] refers to the data source extracted from The Economist online and its article 'The bombs that stopped the happy talk' (January 28, 2010).

The *cognitive method* in the framework of political linguistics was applied to the collected data (Чудинов 2001, Lakoff 2001 2002, Lakoff and Johnson 1999, Arcimavičienė 2010). Metaphorical expressions were located and analysed in the following direction: TEXT > metaphorical expressions [basic meaning vs. contextual meaning = conflation] > conceptual metaphor [TARGET DOMAIN IS SOURCE DOMAIN] > moral implications.

The analysis has shown that TERRORISM in both languages is metaphorically perceived through the following source domains: WAR, CRIME and HEALTH.

Let us consider each metaphorical pattern in more detail.

### WAR metaphor in British media political discourse

The WAR / MILITARY metaphor does not come as a surprise, as the perceptions of new terrorism are based on the declaration of *war on terror*. However, what raises concerns is the moral nature of this metaphor, which unravels pragmatic attitudes or conservative morality in undertaking counter-terrorism measures. The military perception of terrorism is traced in the following metaphorical expressions:

- *counter-terrorism operations, hardline Islamist groups, Al-Qaeda attacked, local targets, al-Qaeda and its allies were in decline both militarily and ideologically, failed attack, terrorist operators seeking to destabilise the region, al-Qaeda is still bent on hitting America with weapons of mass destruction, a bioterror attack, al-Qaeda leaders land a painful blow, protect targets to make attacks harder, the attackers going after softer targets etc.*

The reconstructed military metaphors of WAR ON TERROR and TERRORISTS ARE ENEMIES allow both politicians and journalists to justify the use of violence against terrorists, who are portrayed as utter and unstoppable 'evil' incriminating fear, e. g.:

- (1) <...> *Britain is probably right to think it has more to fear from Islamist terrorism than any other country in Europe.* [A: 5]
- (2) *Such attacks may be rare, but people fear them because the victims are chosen at random and the perpetrators are utterly merciless.* [A: 9]

Moreover, the complementary element of the WAR metaphor is STRENGTH, as in effectively fighting terrorism (i. e. EVIL),

PHYSICAL STRENGTH and the use of AMMUNITION are required. It implies that positive WAR ON TERROR outcomes might be guaranteed by the sufficient exertion of force and strict measures against terrorists, as in the following metaphorical expressions: *propelling manpower, fighting terrorism, protecting targets to make attacks harder etc.*

For that reason the American president Barack Obama is criticized for lacking 'strength' while fighting terrorism, at the same time being referred to as a 'war president', e. g.:

(3) *It is no surprise that the Republicans want to portray Mr Obama as **soft on terrorism**.* [A: 8]

(4) *<...> Mr Obama, the man who would reform health care, is also **a war president**, and one who has not yet proved to Americans that **he can be a success at it**.* [A: 8]

'Softness' in politics (in 3) originates from the ESSENCE metaphor, as reflected in the following conceptual structures: PERSON IS AN OBJECT and PERSON'S CHARACTER IS THE SUBSTANCE THE OBJECT IS MADE OF (Arcimavičienė 2010, p. 118). This conceptualization extends to political discourse as reflected in the use of the political metaphor POLITICIAN'S CHARACTER IS THE SUBSTANCE THE OBJECT IS MADE OF. Linguistically this metaphor is realized through such expressions as *the hard right, the soft left, politicians being a little bit softy, political sloppiness etc.*

Appropriately, POLITICAL SOFTNESS is associated with the lack of strength and strictness. The above statement (in 3) illustrates Barack Obama's 'soft' political attitude to terrorism, as being deficient in strength

and strictness. Hence, political STRENGTH is seen as moral goodness in fighting terrorism.

## WAR metaphor in Lithuanian media political discourse

In the Lithuanian data WAR / MILITARY metaphor has been also reconstructed on the basis of the metaphorical linguistic expressions as follow:

▫ *mūšis su terorizmu, terorizmas kovoja visais frontais ir prieš visus, karas su terorizmu vyksta visame pasaulyje, jis kruvinas ir nepripažįsta gailėsčio, radikalieji islamistai pasiekė dar vieną pergalę, kova su terorizmu, teroristai siekia mobilizuoti rėmėjus ir šalininkus, teroristai smogia bet kur, užkirsti kelią teroristinėms atakoms, likviduoti išpuolių padarinius, karštieji taškai, etc.*

While analysing metaphorical expressions in Lithuanian, it has been observed that significant attention is given to describing terrorists in terms of their committed atrocities, by thus emphasizing the unavailability of 'war on terror'.

Even more, it is maintained that military passivity would immediately infer surrender and uncivilized approach to politics. The argument why the war on terror should be uncompromisingly launched is supported by the description of terrorists' violence and the fear they impose. Here the parallel can be drawn with Thomas Friedman's argument of economic crisis, where he claims that after the end of the Cold War and particularly after 9/11 'people had turned inward and begun to export their fears more than their hopes' (2009, p. 7). Similarly, terrorism depicted in the analysed Lithuanian data particularly exports fears more than hopes, e. g.:



(5) *Iš tikrųjų, karas vyksta visame pasaulyje. Jis kruvinas ir nepripažįsta gailėsčio* [B: 18].

(6) *Organizacija (Al Qaeda) tapo metafizinio blogio, moderniausių technologijų įvaldymo ir gudrumo įsikūnijimu. Tai beveik antžmogiškas darinys* [B: 17].

The use of the EVIL metaphor imposes fear on people, even more, it provides moral justification for any military interventions and actions against terrorism organizations.

To summarize, the use of the MILITARY metaphor in both British and Lithuanian media political discourse has given evidence to pragmatic morality. In this view, strategic thinking follows the pattern of political/economic ends justifying political/economic/social means. Thus, the use of violent measures (i. e. military response) to terrorism is seen as necessary for reaching political ends (i. e. 'eradicating the enemy' or 'fighting the evil'). Paradoxically, the very idea of 'fighting the Evil' by evil measures does not make sense, as it intoxicates societies with fear and spreads feelings of revenge, which subsequently weaken people's minds and democratic values.

## CRIME metaphor

The use of the CRIME metaphor demonstrates terrorism as an evil act disrupting social order within a state and most importantly necessitating punishment. Even more, the use of such metaphor legitimizes the use of any counter-terrorism measures. It should be noted that the CRIME metaphor is categorically bounded with the WAR metaphor, as both allow to conceptually reconstruct TERRORISM in terms of EVIL.

However, in the case of the WAR metaphor, TERRORISM is seen as an EXTERNAL ENEMY / THREAT, to whom the global war is being declared; whereas, in the case of the CRIME metaphor, TERRORISM is metaphorically structured as an INTERNAL ENEMY / THREAT incriminating the internal order of a particular state.

As a complex conceptual system, the CRIME metaphor comprises such cognitive structures as: TERRORIST IS A CRIMINAL and TERRORIST ACT IS A CRIME. These metaphorical groups are linguistically supported by the following metaphorical expressions in the English data:

- *South-East Asia's most wanted fugitives, counter-terrorism operations, the capture or killing of terrorist suspects, killers, big terrorism plots, pursue terrorists and disrupt their plots, detect terrorists' plans, introducing stern laws against terrorism, bomb plots, uncovering terrorists' plots, suicide-bomber giving up his secrets in return for a plea bargain, etc.*

and in the Lithuanian data:

- *ši grupuotė įvykdė virtingų teroristinių aktų, terorizmas yra smurto naudojimas, nukentčia eiliniai piliečiai, išpuoliai prieš nekaltus žmones, teroristai vykdančys barbariškus veiksmus, demoniški veikimo planai, saujelė nusikaltėlių, terorizmo aktas yra aukščiausio lygio neteisingumo pavyzdys, etc.*

In both languages TERRORISM is perceived as an unlawful evil act incriminating fear and disrupting the established social order. Alike in the case of WAR, the CRIME metaphor stimulates the spread of fear, as in most instances terrorism is disclosed in terms of a criminal offence which is unpredictable on the scale of evil, consider the following English utterances, e. g. *Britain <...> has more to fear from Islamist terror-*

ism than any other country in Europe [A: 5], people **fear the attacks** because the **victims are chosen at random** [A: 9], **perpetrators are utterly merciless** [A: 9].

The question that arises as to whether it is possible not to live in the world of fear and what measures should be undertaken to deal with it. The CRIME metaphor in the English data provides the answer to that question in terms of such expressions as *ministers introducing plenty of stern laws* [A: 5], *taking terrorism seriously enough* [A: 8]. Both 'stern' and 'serious' infer authoritarian, tough and uncompromising political approach to terrorism.

Similarly, in the Lithuanian data, fear imposed by terrorism is linguistically supported by the CRIME metaphor, where the reference to the importance of safety measures is made, as in *patariama imtis ypatingų saugumo priemonių* [B: 11].

To summarize, the use of the CRIME metaphor necessitates the importance of radical counter-terrorism measures provided by state governments. This metaphor legitimizes any counter-terrorism measures as a punishment act for the committed 'evil'. At the same time, it has a preventative value, as anything declared punishable is generally avoided. However, the CRIME metaphor has negative social consequences: its use in the public domain (i. e. the media) spreads fear, which in its turn promotes angst and discrimination in a society.

## HEALTH metaphor

As a complex conceptual system, the HEALTH metaphor involves the following cognitive structures: POLITICS IS HEALTH, PROBLEM IS AN ILLNESS,

TERRORISM IS DANGEROUS FOR POLITICAL HEALTH, and TERRORISM IS AN INFECTIOUS VIRUS. These metaphorical groups were reconstructed on the basis of the following metaphorical linguistic expressions in the British sample:

- *severe terrorist threat levels, terrorism landing a painful blow, the virus of jihadism, intervention may neutralise terrorist cells, prevent terrorism, deadly terrorism, vulnerable to terrorist groups, etc.*

and its Lithuanian counterpart:

- *sutramdytas tarptautinis terorizmas, didina mūsų šalies atsparumą terorizmui, pats didžiausias specialiujų tarnybų galvos skausmas, patariama imtis ypatingo saugumo priemonių, pažaboti tarptautinį terorizmą, etc.*

The use of the HEALTH metaphor gives evidence to pragmatic political decision-making. To be more precise, TERRORISM is perceived as an ILLNESS or an INFECTIOUS VIRUS, which implies, if not treated appropriately, 'deadly' consequences. Thus, the spread of terrorism 'virus' has to be stopped, which requires preventative or radical measures or immediate response such as '*renewed direct intervention*' [A: 14] or '*foreign donors*' [A: 3].

Here are some linguistic expressions referring to 'preventative measures' found in the collected samples of the Lithuania data: *tai tikrai didina mūsų šalies atsparumą terorizmo keliamamiems pavojams* [B: 9], *Lietuva įsipareigoja pažaboti tarptautinį terorizmą* [B: 13].

To summarize, the reconstructed HEALTH metaphor demonstrates that TERRORISM in both British and Lithuanian media political discourse is perceived

through the concept of DEADLY VIRUS, which requires preventative methods and immediate response, otherwise it may lead to disastrous consequences. In this view, the concepts of STRENGTH (resistance to 'virus', preventative methods), CONTROL (immediate response, counter-terrorism measures) and ORDER (established by eradicating the 'virus') give evidence to political pragmatism when political problems are solved by 'an-eye-for-an-eye' principle.

## Conclusions

The reconstructed TERROR metaphors in British and Lithuanian media political discourse allow indentifying the following aspects:

1. Despite the fact that data was collected from the media sources covering different time patterns, i. e. [www.economist.com](http://www.economist.com) (2010) and [www.politika.lt](http://www.politika.lt) (2005, 2006, 2007, 2008), analogous metaphors of WAR (TERRORISM IS AN EVIL ENEMY / EXTERNAL THREAT), CRIME (TERRORISM IS AN UNPREDICTABLE AND DAN-

GEROUS CRIMINAL / INTERNAL THREAT) and HEALTH (TERRORISM IS A DEADLY VIRUS) have been reconstructed.

2. Their use allows characterising British and Lithuanian politics in terms of pragmatic morality.
3. In this view, political decisions related to TERRORISM are motivated by such cognates as STRENGTH (prioritized for fighting 'evil', i. e. terrorism), CONTROL (eradicating the 'virus', i. e. terrorism), ORDER (capturing the 'fearsome criminal', i. e. terrorism, by thus establishing social order).
4. What raises concern is that the use of MILITARY, CRIME and HEALTH metaphors in media political discourse spreads the endless fear of terrorism, which might eventually lead to terrorphobia. The analysis also demonstrates the level at which journalists promote fear of terrorism by exploiting the image of terrifying war scenes, serious criminal activities and the deadly virus rapidly contaminating social order.

## References

- ARCIMAVIČIENĖ, L., 2010. *Morality models in media political discourse: a cross-linguistic perspective*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing House.
- HALSALL, P., 1997. *The Internet Modern History Source Book*. Available from: URL <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/modsbook> (accessed on November 5, 2010).
- ELSHTAIN, J. B., 2004. What's Morality Got to Do with It? Making the Right Distinctions. In: E. F. PAUL, M. PAUL, JR. J. PAUL. *Morality and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–14.
- FAIRCLOUGH, N., 2001. *Language and Power*. London: Pearson Education Limited, Harlow.
- FRIEDMAN, Th., 2009. *Hot, Flat and Crowded. Why we need a green revolution – and how it can renew America*. Picador / Farrar, Straus and Giroux: New York.
- FAUCONNIER, G., TURNER, M., 2002. *Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
- HELLSTEN, I., 2002. *The Politics of Metaphor: Biotechnology and Biodiversity in the Media*. Tampere: Tampere University Press. Available



from: URL <http://acta.uta.fi/pdf/951-44-5380-8.pdf> (accessed on October 25, 2010).

JOHNSON, M., 1993. *Moral Imagination: Implications of Cognitive Science for Ethics*. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.

KÖVECSES, Z., 2002. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LAKOFF, G., JOHNSON, M., 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

LAKOFF, G., 2001. *Metaphors of Terror*. Available from: URL <http://www.press.uchicago.edu/News/911lakoff.html> (accessed on November 5, 2010).

LAKOFF, G., 2002. *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Chicago/London: Chicago University Press.

MCLEAN, A., MCMILLAN, A., 1996. *Concise dictionary of politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

SPENCER, A., 2006a. The Problems of Evaluating Counter-Terrorism. *UNISCI Discussion Papers*, vol. 12, 179–201.

SPENCER, A., 2006b. Questioning the Concept of New Terrorism. *Peace, Conflict and Development*, vol. 8, 1–33.

SPENCER, A., 2008. The Metaphor of Terror: Terrorism Studies and the Constructivist Turn. *Security Dialogue*, vol. 39 (6), 571–592.

TURNER, M., 2001. *Cognitive Dimensions of Social Science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ЧУДИНОВ, А. П., 2001. *Россия в метафорическом зеркале: Когнитивное исследование политической метафоры*. Екатеринбург: Урал гос. пед. ун-т.

### Liudmila Arcimavičienė

Vilnius universitetas, Lietuva

*Moksliniai interesai: kognityvinė lingvistika, konceptualiosios metaforos teorija, politinio diskurso analizė, politinė filosofija*

### Liudmila Arcimavičienė

Vilnius University, Lithuania

*Research interests: cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphor, media political discourse analysis, political philosophy*

## TERORIZMO METAFOROS VIEŠAJAME POLITINIAME DISKURSE: KOGNITYVINIŲ MODELIŲ ANALIZĖ

### Santrauka

Paskutiniaisiais dešimtmečiais tiek Vakarų, tiek Lietuvos mokslininkai vis daugiau dėmesio skiria kontrastyvinei metaforų analizei viešajame diskurse, ypač politikos ir ekonomikos srityse. Gretinant ir analizuojant metaforų sandarą, nustatomi tarpkultūriniai ypatumai, kurie leidžia daryti išvadas apie visuomenės poreikius, interesus ir vertinimus. Todėl gretinamoji lingvistinės metaforos analizė šiandien yra labai aktuali, nes būtent ji atspindi šiuolaikinės visuomenės vertybių sistemą, kuria remiantis priimami svarbūs politiniai ir ekonominiai sprendimai. Jų sąsaja su žmogaus ir visuomenės moralės modeliais neabejotinai, o jų metaforinė raiška kalboje, remiantis anglų kalbos medžiaga kiek giliau analizuota

## TERRORISM IN MEDIA POLITICAL DISCOURSE: FROM METAPHORICAL EXPRESSIONS TO COGNITIVE MODELS

### Summary

During the last decades both Western and Lithuanian scientists have confined close attention to the cross-cultural studies of metaphor in various representations of public discourse, especially in economics and politics. By analysing and contrasting the complexity of metaphor, cross-cultural peculiarities can be discerned, which have social, economic and political implications. Thus the analysis of metaphorical expressions and reconstruction of conceptual metaphors allow to determine a system of moral expectations underlying significant economic and political decisions. The metaphor-morality relationship has been widely discussed by American linguists, while in Lithuania it has been insufficient.

amerikiečių lingvistikoje, lietuvių kalbotyroje iki šiol išsamiau nenagrinėta. Šiuo tyrimu norėta prisidėti prie esamų kontrastyvinių metaforos tyrinėjimų bei giliau pažvelgti į diskurso ypatumus viešojoje erdvėje, atskleidžiant moralės modelius, kuriais vadovaujamosi vertinant TERORIZMĄ Lietuvos bei Didžiosios Britanijos viešajame diskurse.

Šio straipsnio tikslas – remiantis metaforinių pasakymų analize, nustatyti TERORIZMO vyraujančius kognityvinius modelius Didžiosios Britanijos ir Lietuvos viešajame politiniame diskurse. Tyrimui buvo pasirinkta trisdešimt šešis politinius straipsnius iš *The Economist* ir [www.politika.lt](http://www.politika.lt) elektroninių archyvų. Straipsniai analizuojami remiantis kognityvinės lingvistikos principais bei kokybiniu analizės metodu (Lakoff and Johnson 1999, Johnson 1993, Lakoff 2001 2002, Elshtain 2004, Fairclough 2001, Spencer 2006, 2008, Turner 1994 etc.), kurie leidžia atskleisti metaforiniuose kalbiniuose pasakymuose (metaphorical linguistic expressions) glūdinčias konceptualiąsias metaforas (kognityvinius modelius). Nustatyta, kad TERORIZMO politinis vertinimas Didžiosios Britanijos ir Lietuvos viešajame politiniame diskurse yra grindžiamas konceptualiosiomis metaforomis TERORIZMAS YRA KARAS, TERORIZMAS YRA KRIMINALINĖ VEIKLA ir TERORIZMAS YRA LIGA. Išanalizavus šių metaforų kalbinę raišką, paaiškėjo, kad straipsniuose vyrauja neigiamas TERORIZMO vertinimas, kuriantis ir skleidžiantis socialines baimes (terofobiją) viešojoje erdvėje.

REIKŠMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: viešasis politinis diskursas, terorizmas, metaforiniai lingvistiniai pasakymai, metafora, pragmatinė politika.

This study aims at analysing metaphorical expressions and reconstructing TERRORISM metaphors in British and Lithuanian media political discourse in the theoretical framework of cognitive linguistics and political philosophy (Lakoff and Johnson 1999, Johnson 1993, Elshtain 2004, Fairclough 2001, Spencer 2006, Turner 2002, etc.). For that purpose, thirty-six analytical articles searched by the key word 'terrorism (En.) / terorizmas (Lith.)' were collected from the online archives of *The Economist* and [www.politika.lt](http://www.politika.lt). The method applied to investigate the collected data is that of qualitative analysis in the theoretical framework of cognitive linguistics and conceptual metaphor theory (Чудинов 2001, Fauconnier and Turner 2002, Kövecses 2002, Lakoff 2001, 2002 etc.). The findings reveal that despite different time patterns of the collected data sources (i. e. English 2010; Lithuanian 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008), the analogous metaphors of TERRORISM IS WAR (MILITARY metaphor), TERRORISM IS CRIME (CRIME metaphor) and TERRORISM IS A VIRUS (HEALTH metaphor) have been reconstructed. Their analysis shows the prevalence of pragmatic political morality to TERRORISM governed by the concepts of STRENGTH, ORDER and CONTROL. Even more, their use spreads fear of terrorism by exploiting the image of terrifying war scenes, serious criminal activities, and the deadly virus rapidly contaminating social order.

KEY WORDS: media political discourse, terrorism, metaphorical linguistic expressions, conceptual metaphor, pragmatic politics.

Įteikta 2010 m. lapkričio 15 d.