A Cognitive Study of War Metaphors in Five Main Areas of Everyday English: Politics, Business, Sport, Disease and Love

Sun Ling

EN2301

Level III English, Autumn 2010

School of Teacher Education

Kristianstad University

Tutor: Carita Lundmark

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Metaphors lie at the heart of language itself. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argue that the pervasion of metaphor is both in thought and everyday language. In a cognitive linguistic view, conceptual metaphors shape not only our communication, but also the way we think and act. Metaphor plays a very significant role in human thought, understanding or even creating our social, cultural, and psychological reality, because it is used effortlessly by ordinary people in everyday life. Attempting to understand metaphor means understanding what kind of world we live in. As a basic cognitive structure, metaphor helps us to understand a relatively abstract concept by means of more concrete concept.

The domain of war is employed metaphorically for all types of human struggle and conflict. War metaphors have become an indispensable part of the English language over hundreds of years, since more and more war terms like *besiege, fight for, win out, attack, battle and fend off* are widely use by ordinary people in everyday language. Nowadays, hundreds of military terms are applied to non-military situations in everyday speech or writing, which has been a normal process, since people are likely to draw upon experiences in one area of life to understand experiences in another. For example, we have war terms to describe love in our daily language. He *won* her hand in marriage. She is *besieged* by suitors. She *fought for* him, but his mistress *won out*. He has to *fend* them *off*. Most speakers of English consider this way of speaking about marriage or love as normal and natural for everyday purpose and they even do not notice that they are using metaphors. Since war terms are so pervasively used in everyday language, it is worthy to study the reason why war metaphors are so widely adopted by people in everyday language and in what areas are war terms often metaphorically applied as well as how war metaphors work in these different areas to help people understand abstract target domains. Therefore, this paper will analyze the use of war metaphors in different areas of English everyday language.

1.1 Aim

This paper aims to apply the theory of conceptual metaphor to give a detailed analysis of how war metaphors work in five areas of English language, namely, politics, business, sport, disease and love. There are two main reasons to choose these five areas. First, they are closely related to people's daily life. Second, all these five areas are often compared to war. In this paper, mappings and major theme involved in each conceptual metaphor (POLITICS IS WAR,

BUSINESS IS WAR, SPORT IS WAR, DISEASE IS WAR and LOVE IS WAR) will be discussed in a detailed way to help people understand the reasons why these war expressions are widely used to comprehend different target domians.

1.2 Material

Identifying war terms is the first step of this research. War terms refer to the words or expressions used in military situation, such as *battle, attack, bombard, strategy, fight, defeat, campaign, battle, win, victory*, etc. Through searching Google, two websites are found to collect war terms. One is Wikipedia and the other is Knowgramming. In Knowgramming, there is a short list of metaphors born from war terms. The Knowgramming website is important for this research due to the fact that it offers a list of regular war terms used in metaphorical way by people. However, this list still does not cover all war terms used in the area of politics, business, sport, disease and love, the other website Wikipedia is consulted as supplement since a category of all military terminology is found there. Finally, 20 war terms are selected since they are high frequently used in everyday language by searching google. 13 war terms are from Knowgramming website, while the other 7 are from Wikipedia.

The example sentences in this study are selected from the British National Corpus (BNC) online and Google. BNC collects a 100 million words of samples both in written and spoken language of British English from a wide range of sources. By putting in the war terms in BNC, a random of 50 results will be given out for each search. In general, many examples do not include metaphorical expressions of war terms for the first time searching, so several times for searching one war term is inevitable. Since most examples from BNC are about politics and business and very few example sentences on other topics, Google is also used as a supplement if a relevant example sentence cannot be found after searching four times in BNC. With the help of these two websites, examples are collected in a convenient way. Totally, 32 example sentences are selected. 24 examples are from BNC, whereas the rest examples are collected from Google. It is necessary to mention that the example sentences collected from BNC are free online version which is lack of the context, so some other different interpretations may occur and it is the limitation of this study.

1.3 Method

First, the examples of metaphorical expressions of war terms will be identified. Second, the selected examples with war metaphors will be classified into categories or subcategories

2

according to different target domain and then underlying major themes and mappings will be discussed. Small capital letters will be used for the statement of conceptual metaphors and bold italics for metaphorical linguistic expressions.

2. Theoretical Background

In this section, first, a definition of metaphor and some key concepts concerning metaphor such as conceptual metaphor, structural metaphor, conventioal metaphor and the scope of metaphor will be illustrated one by one in detail. Second, related previous studies on metaphors as well as war metaphors will be discussed.

2.1 Conceptual metaphor

In the cognitive linguistic view, metaphor is a conceptual phenomenon which basically relates to what happens in the mind. Lakoff proposes that metaphor contains a cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system to understand or think of one thing in terms of something else (Lakoff 1993: 203). The concept of metaphor is further defined by Kövecses. Conceptual metaphor means that conceptual domain (A) is conceptual domain (B) (Kövecses 2002: 4). The two domains involve in conceptual metaphor are called source domain and target domain respectively. Source domain refers to the conceptual domain used to help understand another conceptual domain. Target domain refers to the conceptual domain which we try to understand it via source domain (Kövecses 2002: 12). Usually speaking, an abstract concept is used as target, while a more concrete concept is employed as its source.

People will talk about target domains like life, argument, love, ideas, social organization by means of using journey, war, building, food and plants as their source domain. For instance, *He **attacked every weak point in** my argument. His criticisms were **right on target*** (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 9). Most English speakers use these linguistic expressions conventionally to talk about argument, because understanding the abstract concept of argument is facilitated by the more concrete concept of war. The conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR is revealed by metaphorical expression *attacked every weak point in* and *right on target* in this example. The abstract concept ARGUMENT is comprehended via the concept WAR, so WAR is the source domain and ARGUMENT is the target domain. According to Lakoff & Johnson, using the expressions from war terms, e.g., *attack a position, strategy, win, etc*., to talk about argument is no accident, because some part of conceptual network of battle characterizes the concept of an argument (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 11).

Conceptual metaphors can be classified into different types in terms of conventionality, function, nature, and level of generality of metaphor (Kövecses 2002: 29). Conceptual metaphors are classified into three types on the basis of its cognitive functions: structural metaphors, ontological metaphors and orientational metaphors. Another way to classify metaphors is based on conventionality. Conventional metaphors are deeply entrenched which are used by ordinary people for everyday purposes. Since this paper focuses on the war metaphors, the concepts of structure metaphor and conventional metaphor will be discussed in the following.

2.1.1 Structural metaphor

The cognitive function of structural metaphor is to make people understand target A via the structure of source B, so source domain usually has rich knowledge for understanding the target concept. Many mappings between elements of A and elements of B involve in structural metaphors to help understand abstract target domains. According to Kövecses (2002: 33), mappings are significant, because they explain why the particular expressions are used to understand the target domain. Kövecses takes the metaphor TIME IS MOTION as an example to further illustrate how time is understood via motion. He says that people understand time through some basic elements such as physical objects, their locations, and their motion. On the basis of the background condition that the present time is at the same location as a canonical observer, a set of mappings can be found in the following: Times are things. The passing of time is motion. Future times are in front of the observer; past times are behind the observer. The notion of time is illustrated clearly by this set of mappings.

The above example shows that without metaphor, it is difficult to understand the concept of time. In this sense, structure metaphors help people understand target concepts via mappings. Lakoff and Johnson state that structural metaphors are culturally grounded in our experience. They take ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor as an example to illustrate how argument is conceptualized in terms of physical conflict. Animals fight to get what they want-food, sex, territory, etc. As part of being a rational animal, we humans usually do not carry out physical conflict to get what we want. More often than not, we resort to verbal arguments to get what we want. In this sense, verbal battles are comprehended in the same terms as physical battles (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 62).

2.1.2 Conventional metaphor

Metaphors can also be classified in terms of their degree of conventionality. Conventional metaphor is a metaphor that well worn or deeply entrenched in everyday use by ordinary people for everyday purposes (Kövecses 2002: 29). Examples of conventional metaphors from Kövecses (2002: 29) are as follow:

ARGUMENT IS WAR: *I **defended** my argument.*
LOVE IS A JOURNEY: *We'll just have to **go our separate ways**.*
IDEAS ARE FOOD: *I can't **digest** all these facts.*
(Kövecses 2002: 29)

The metaphorical expressions given above are highly conventionalized, because they are well worn or even clichéd. Speakers do not even notice that they use metaphors when they use the expression *defend* in relate to arguments, *go our separate ways* in relate to love and *digest* in relate to ideas. Thus, these conventional metaphorical expressions are deeply entrenched ways for people to think about an abstract domain like argument, journey, food, etc. (Kövecses 2002: 30).

2.2 Mappings: working mechanism of conceptual metaphor

As mechanism of conceptual metaphor, mappings help people understand how conceptual metaphor works. Lakoff (1993: 208) says that the mapping is a fixed part of conceptual system. The definition of mapping is further improved by Kövecses. As he puts it, mappings are a set of fixed conceptual correspondences that exist between constituent elements of the source and the target domain (Kövecses 2002: 12). It is mappings between a source and a target domain that help people understand one domain in terms of another. Take the conceptual metaphor SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS ARE PLANTS as an example to understand how mappings make up a conceptual metaphor. The following examples are taken from Kövecses (2002: 8):

SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS ARE PLANTS
*He works for the local **branch** of the bank.*
*Our company is **growing**.*
*They had to **prune** the workforce.*
*The organization was **rooted** in the old church.*
*There is now a **flourishing** black market in software there.*
*His business **blossomed** when the railways put his establishment within reach of the big city.*

*Employers **reaped** enormous benefits from cheap foreign labour.*
(Kövecses 2002: 8)

According to the metaphorical linguistic expressions above, the mappings between plant and social organization can be got in the following (Kövecses 2002: 8) :

Source: PLANT   *Target*: SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

(a) the whole plant   →the entire organization

(b) a part of the plant   →a part of the organization

(c) growth of the plant   →development of the organization

(d) removing a part of the plant   →reducing the organization

(e) the root of the plant   →the origin of the organization

(f) the flowering   →the best stage, the most successful stage

What constitutes the SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS ARE PLANTS metaphor is not any particular word or expression. It is the mappings that connect the source domain of plants to the target domain of social organizations. Lakoff (1993: 208) illustrates that mapping is one of our conventional ways to conceptualize things. Mappings are not arbitrary, but grounded in everyday experience and knowledge. These mappings provide us with much meaning of the metaphorical linguistic expressions, so they make a particular conceptual metaphor understood easily. To know a conceptual metaphor is to know the set of mappings that applies to a given source-target pairing, so mappings will be concentrated on when metaphors are to be analyzed.

2.3 The scope of metaphor

As a matter of fact, most source domains do not just apply to one target concept but several. The concept WAR applies not only to argument but also to politics, business and love, etc. The scope of metaphor focuses on the issue that how many and what kind of target domains a single source concept can characterize. Take source domain of buildings as an example, which applies to several targets. The following examples are taken from Kövecses (2002: 110):

THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS: *Increasingly, scientific knowledge **is constructed** by small
numbers of specialized workers.*
RELATIONSHIPS ARE BUILDINGS: *Since then the two have **built a solid** relationship.*

CAREERS ARE BUILDINGS: *Her career was **in ruins**.*
A COMPANY IS A BUILDING: *Ten years ago, he and a partner set up on their own and **built up** a successful fashion company.*
A LIFE IS A BUILDING: *Now another young woman's life is **in ruins** after an appalling attack.*
(Kövecses 2002: 110)

Kövecses (2002: 110) says that the whole range of building terms can apply to these target domains in real life. The source domain BUILDING is applied to several targets like theory, relationship, career, which are generalized as complex system. The thing connects these conceptual metaphors above is that they all have certain specific features of complex systems. In other words, these conceptual metaphors have a main meaning focus or a major theme. Kövecses (2002: 110) states that each source domain has a particular meaning focus which can be mapped onto the target. The main meaning focus reflects some basic knowledge in connection with a source that is widely shared by people within a certain speech community, so it is conventionally fixed or agreed-on. The basic and central knowledge about buildings are: 1. Buildings have a groundwork and foundation on which a framework or structure is built, and the framework or structure stands above the ground. 2. If the framework or structure is not solid or does not have a strong foundation, it will collapse.

2.4 Previous research

The study of metaphor can be traced back to Aristotle who regards metaphor as a matter of language in a traditional way (Lakoff 1993: 202). The traditional views of metaphor were overturned when George Lakoff and Mark Johnson put forward the new view of metaphor from cognitive perspective in their book *Metaphors We Live By* in 1980 (Philip 2000:1). They argue that metaphor is a conceptual phenomenon rather than a language phenomenon. The study of conceptual metaphor is further developed by Kövecses. He gives a much detailed explanation of metaphor in his book *Metaphor: a practical introduction,* which helps reader have a good understanding of conceptual metaphor. Because of these two books, research on metaphor has become one of the central fields of language research.

As for war metaphors, very few studies have been done through investigation. Only one book concerning war metaphors is found in Swedish national library. In the book *War Metaphors: How President's Use the Language of War to Sell Policy,* Bacharach traces the evolution of metaphorical wars from rhetoric into public policy and also addresses the original goal for the president to use the language of war metaphors (Marc N: 2006). Another scholar Paula (Liendo, P: 2001) analyzes the widespread use of war metaphors in business language

by presenting examples of business texts containing war metaphors and then finds out the implications of this rhetorical choice. One more article related to war metaphors is found in CNKI (Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure). Yang Fengping (2009) analyzes the use of war metaphors in headlines of sports news reporting. The study finds that a large number of war metaphorical expressions are contained in sports news reporting in English. War metaphors appear in the headlines accounts for 45.5% in the baseball sports news reporting, 72% in basketball sports news reporting and 60.2% in football sports news reporting. In addition, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson mention ARGUMENT IS WAR in their book *Metaphors We Live By.* They point out that arguments and wars are different kinds of things-verbal discourse and armed conflict; however, ARGUMENT is partially structured, understood, performed and talked about in terms of WAR. A portion of the conceptual network of battle partially characterizes the concept of an argument (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 5).

3 . Analysis and discussion

In this part, the metaphorical expression of war terms will be presented. These selected examples with war metaphors will be classified into categories in terms of different target domains. Ways of understanding these war metaphors will be further discussed in this chapter including major themes and mappings. The examples in the following paragraphs will be marked by using square brackets at the end to show where they come from. If an example is selected from Google, it will be marked with [Google]. If the example is taken from the BNC, it will be marked like [AHX 762], since [AHX 762] is the code which comes after the example sentence.

3.1 POLITICS IS WAR

Politics has something to do with power. According to Wikipedia (2010), politics refers to "the regulation of public affairs within a political unit and to the use of methods and tactics to formulate and apply policy." It consists of social relations involving authority or power. Politics contains a variety of elements including politicians, political parties and politic events. Political power can be conceptualized as physical force. The source domain concepts of war are often mapped onto the target domain concepts of politics, since these two domains share some similarities. This can be observed in the following examples.

3.1.1 A POLITICAL ELECTION IS A BATTLE ON A BATTLEFIELD

The concept of political election can be comprehended via people's experience in a war. The process for each party to prepare a political election can be conceptualized as the process to prepare a war, since both human resources and financial resources are taken into account in these two activities. The intense competition among different parties in a political election is like a battle in a war.

> (1) *Rival Democratic presidential candidates Mr Bill Clinton and Mr Jerry Brown taunted each other at the weekend as mudslinging in the **battle** for votes [AHX 762].*
> (2) *The main election **battleground** now would seem to be the political interviews on television [BNT 1636].*

In the example (1), the word *battle* indicates that fighting over votes between two politicians by making speeches or having verbal arguments is like a fight between two soldiers, since the aim of the competition is to contend for the domination of the nation. Moreover, the contest between two or more parites in a political election is quite fierce. It is the same case in example (2) when politicians from two or more parties show up on television to address their election speeches. Politicians try to use words to triumph over their opponents.

3.1.2 POLITICIANS ARE SOLDIERS

The heated debates among politicians can be regarded as confrontations between two troops in a war. Therefore, politicians who fighting for the interests of their own parties are soldiers.

> (3) *President Delors also came **under fire** from Tory MPs [K97 16248].*
> (4) *The party expects its young hopefuls to **fight** at least one unwinnable seat in a rotting inner city [ADB 498].*

The meaning of war term *under fire* is subjected to enemy attack. This concept is mapped on example (3) to show that President Delors' situation is like a soldier who is attacked by the enemy, because the president is strongly criticized by Tory MPs. In example (4), young hopeful politicians are expected to fight for a seat in inner city just like soldiers fighting for their country in a war.

3.1.3 POLITICAL STRATEGIES ARE WAR STRATEGIES

Different kinds of strategies will be employed by commanders in order to win a battle. Undoubtedly, the politicians often adopt all the strategies they can think out to win the election.

(5) *Political analysts said Tuesday's outspoken comments by Mr Chirac — like Mr Giscard d'Estaing a candidate for the presidency — seemed to be a **tactic** to dissuade Mr Mitterrand from offering him the premiership rather than an attempt to force the president out immediately [*K5M 11289**]**.*
(6) *In other words, ambitious Labour politicians will have to apply the same **strategies** that **win** national elections to internal party contests [A2W 95].*

In example (5), Mr Chirac hopes to persuade Mr Mitterrand not to offer him the premiership by adopting the strategy of making outspoken comments. Obviously, the tactics used by politicians resemble the strategies used in a war. The example (6) can be explained in the same way. Strategies are also employed by politicians to win national elections. The concrete concept *war strategies* help people understand the tactics used by politicians in the political election.

3.1.4 THE OUTCOME OF POLITICS IS THE OUTCOME OF WAR

The consequence of a political election can be understood via the war terms *win*, *lose* or *truce*.

(7) *Meanwhile the Conservative Party was regrouping its forces after the **defeat** of 1945, building up better-organized and larger constituency parties and reorganizing its ideology [FB5 741**]**.*
(8) *National politics, by contrast, has become all too predictable: the Republicans **win** the White House; the Democrats hold Congress [ABD 757**]**.*
(9) *In 1940, thanks to the party **truce**, he was elected for Preston, but lost in the election of 1945 [GT7 953].*

The war term *defeat* means failure to win or succeed. From example (7), we can see that the Conservative Party lost the election of 1945 just like an army failed in a battle. Thus, the metaphorically use of *defeat* is adopted in this sentence. The metaphorical use of the word *win* in example (8) is understood in the same way. If the Republicans win the White House as predicted, it means that the Republican Party defeats the Democratic Party successfully in the election and becomes the ruling party of the United States. The word *truce* means that each side in a war agrees with the other to suspend aggressive actions. When this concept is mapped onto politics, it shows that both sides of parties are agreed to stop fighting each other and then find a way to settle the disputes or it means that politicians reach a consensus on a particular issue. The term *truce* conveys such a meaning in example (9).

3.1.5 Major theme and mappings

Major theme is some basic knowledge related to a source that is widely shared by people within a certain speech community, so it is conventionally fixed or agreed-on. The source

domain of WAR contains a series of elements like *battle*, *battleground*, *army*, *soldiers*, *win a battle*, *lose a battle*, etc. While talking about war, people would have a general idea that there are at least two or more organized groups, and each group has its own positions and armed forces. Groups fight with each other for territory, treasure or something else. The objective of war differs in accord with a group's role in a conflict. The goals of offensive war are typically the assimilation or destruction of another group, while the goals of defensive war are simply the repulsion of the offensive force and often survival itself. If one group launches the attack, the other should defend. When the war is over, one army gets triumph, while the other becomes the loser or both two sides are losers.

The same situation can apply to politics. Politics is often conceptualized as war lies in the involvement of violent competition. In a political election, two or more parties will carry out fierce contest in order to win the election. Different parties hold different political stands and political ideas. When one party launches the attack in political speeches, the other party will answer back. Parties will fight with each other fiercely to gain interests for their own. In the process of election, each politician or party will make use of all efficient strategies or tactics in order to win the election. In this sense, the process of political election between two or more parties is like a war between two or more armies.

Since most examples above related to conceptual metaphor POLITICS IS WAR are about political election, the mappings about how political election is understood via metaphorical expressions of war terms can be illustrated as follows:

POLITICS IS WAR

Source: WAR   *Target*: POLITICS

(a) armies in a war   →parties in a political campaign

(b) soldiers in a war   →politicians in a certain political campaign

(c) battles in a war   →election in a political campaign

(d) victory in a war   →success in a political campaign

(e) defeat in a war   →failure in a political campaign

(f) war strategies   →political tactics or strategies

These conceptual correspondences above involved in the structual metaphor POLITICS IS WAR help people well understand how the concrete source domain WAR is mapped onto the abstract target domain POLITICS. The expressions from the vocabulary of war, e.g.

strategy, win, *defeat*, *fight*, *battle*, *battleground*, etc., form a systematic way of talking about the aspects of politics. Winning a political election can be comprehended via the concept of winning a war. Fighting for votes can be understood through the concept of fighting for territory or treasure in a war. This result is supported by Lakoff and Johnson who summarize that metaphorical expressions in our language are tied to metaphorical concepts in a systematic way and people can use metaphorical linguistic expressions to understand the metaphorical concepts (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 7).

3.2 BUSINESS IS WAR

The domain of war often applies to the domain of business. The basic elements of business are companies, market, business policy and commercial activities, while the elements of war contain armies, battleground, strategies, results, etc. The business competition can be described by using some expressions related to war in that these war terms can well reflect the intensity of commercial competition. Some linguistic expressions of war terms are commonly found in business situations.

3.2.1 BUSINESS COMPETITION IS THE FIGHT IN A WAR

In business competition, companies will carry out ferocious fight to seize markets, which can be conceived as a bloody battle. Companies might be survive and even develop a lot in a business competition, or sometimes they might be go bankrupt in the end.

> (10) *Meanwhile, Microsoft is **attacking** Google's biggest business, search [Google]*
> (11) *Are European banks about to **invade** America — again? [ABK 2698]*

The war term *attack* means deliberately take action to hurt a person or damage a place. When it is used in business situations like in example (10), it means that Microsoft, the biggest computer software supplier in the world, will take the initiative in competing with Google for the online business of searching. In this example sentence, the two companies Microsoft and Google are conceptualized as two armies in a war. In example (11), the word *invade* helps people easily understand that the activity of foreign banks (European banks) seeking to enter into or even seize the American financial market is like an army trying to invade other countries.

3.2.2 THE MARKET IS THE BATTLEFIELD

The market is conceptualized as the battlefield in business competition, because a series of commercial activities or commercial rivalry, such as sales promotes and coming out of innovative products, are carried out in the market.

> (12) *As to the problem whether Mercedes-Benz and BMW can keep their status in the global luxury car market, China luxury market has become the most important **battlefield** [Google].*
> (13) *In common with other leading manufacturers, Nike has majored on fit as the latest sports shoe **battleground**, but the Oregonians have arrived at their solution in a relatively minimalist fashion [CB4 1545].*

According to example (12), China luxury market is regarded as the most important battlefield where major car companies like Mercedes-Benz and BMW will compete with each other. As for example (13), the sports shoe market can be compared to a battleground, since many shoe manufacturers will fight fiercely in order to capture the market share. In short, market is the battlefield for companies in a business battle, so win a battlefield means win the market.

3.2.3 THE COMPANIES ARE THE ARMIES

The companies are considered as armies in a business battlefield in that the commercial competition is a fighting between companies.

> (14) *But those are just two of the many fronts in Google's **war** with Microsoft [Google]*
> (15) *While that takes one of Google's **enemies** out of its sights, it means that its lone major rival will have more resources and motivation behind it [Google]*

The two companies Microsoft and Google are conceptualized as two armies in the example (14) to help people understand that there is a very fierce business competition between these two companies. The word *war* straightly tells people that the two companies will fight with each other for the Internet business. According to Wikipedia, the term *enemy* means an opposing military force. When this concept is mapped on the example (15), people can understand that enemies of Google are those companies opposing or competing with Google.

3.2.4 BUSINESS STRATEGY IS STRATEGY USED IN THE WAR

War strategies like *salvo*, *retreat*, etc. are often applied in the business situation. Therefore, the abstract concept of business strategies can be comprehended via the concrete concept of war strategies.

(16) *Microsoft is ready to **fire** its first **salvo** against Apple [Google].*
(17) *Meeting the competition necessitated a more risky **strategy**: head-on confrontation at the low-price end of the market [A11 487].*
(18) *Lopez said that Big City Brewing was disappointed about Lascelles' decision to **retreat** from the market, saying the partnership with the subsidiary of powerful conglomerate Lascelles de-Mercado [Google].*

The war term *salvo* refers to the simultaneous discharge of artillery or bombs. From it, the example (16) can be understood that Microsoft Corporation prepares to take a series of business actions or strategies to compete with its opponent, the Apple Company. In example (17), the strategy of conducting a head-on confrontation at the low-price end of the market is similar to the strategy adopted by commanders to fight with enemy directly. Thus, business strategies are strategies used in the war. The term *retreat* originally means withdraw military force. When it is mapped onto business situation, taking the example (18) as an example, it means that Lascelles de-Mercado Company takes a strategy of not competing with other companies temporarily in the beer market of Jamaica.

3.2.5 THE OUTCOME OF BUSINESS IS THE OUTCOME OF WAR

The outcome of a business competition is wining the market or losing the market, which is similar to the outcome of a war. The outcome of a war is wining the battle or failing the battle.

(19) *Despite this, western companies are queuing up to **win** contracts [ABF 2362].*
(20) *If the Americans with their peace talks do get the parties together, their first business will be to arrange a **truce** so that food can move [ABG 1377].*

The example (19) reflects that winning a business is like winning a war. If a company gets the contracts, it is the winner; while other companies become the losers. In example (20), when two parties agree to truce, it means that they will stop the dispute or disagreement. In the end, no party is the winner.

3.2.6 Major theme and mappings

The competition between two companies or organizations in the market is just like the fight between armies in a war. The major theme of the conceptual metaphor BUSINESS IS WAR

is similar to politics. People can find many similarities between the source domain war and the target domain business. As for the purpose of a war is to beat the enemy, the aim of business competition between two or more rivals in the economic war are striving to gain an advantage or victory so that they can obtain the market areas and market shares. The strategies adopted in a war correspond to those in business competition. Businessmen will adopt various strategies they can think out to realize their business objectives. In the business war, if one's market is occupied by another company, it means that the market is invaded, and the other company is the invader. In order to protect its own territory, the company must defense to beat the other company. On the basis of the basic knowledge above, business competition can be conceptualized as war among rivals.

According to the analysis above, it shows that the structural metaphor BUSINESS IS WAR is quite well-structured and more readily understandable, because many abstract concepts of business is clearly understood through the source domain of WAR. The mapping process of the structural metaphor BUSINESS IS WAR can be concluded as follows:

BUSINESS IS WAR

Source: WAR   *Target*: BUSINESS

(a) armies   →companies

(b) soldiers   →businessmen

(c) battles   →price competition

(d) battlefield   →market

(e) winning a war   →seizing market

(f) losing a war   →losing market

(g) strategies in a war   →marketing strategies or policy

From these mappings and the major theme above, we can see that using the expressions from war terms to talk about business is no accident, because many parts of conceptual network of war characterize the concept of business. Companies corrspond to armies in a war. Businessmen correspond to soldiers in a war. Price competition correspond to battles in a war.

The conceptual metaphor BUSINESS IS WAR structures the action companies take in business by using words like *attack*, *retreat*, *invade*, *fire salvo*, etc. This findings is similar to the sample ARGUMENT IS WAR provided by Lakoff & Johnson (2003), since they

conclude that the use of war metaphors to understand the target domain ARGUMENT is no accident. They argue that though there is no physical battle, there is a verbal battle and the structure of an argument-attack, defense, counterattack, etc.-reflect this. The ARGUMENT IS WAR metaphor structures the actions we perform in arguing (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 4).

3.3 SPORT IS WAR

Both sports and war have a long history. Sometimes the line between sports and war is not very clear, since these two activities have something to do with physical force. A major reason why sports are often conceptualized as war is that the participants of both activities should have physical fitness and courage. People often refer to important sporting events as *battles*. People may say *shoot* when they want some athletes to go ahead. Examples in the following can well illustrate the conceptual metaphor SPORT IS WAR.

3.3.1 A SPORT EVENT IS A WAR

According to Wikipedia (2010), a sport is "an organized, competitive and skillful physical activity requiring commitment, strategy and fair play, in which a winner can be defined by objective means." Sport event is often conceptualized as war, since people are likely to employ the concept of war to think about or to describe conflicts or competing activities.

(21) *The **Battle** for the Thorpe Cup was **fought** between two boys' football teams in exciting matches [CCG 343].*
(22) *Nigeria focused on **defending against** Argentine playmakers Lionel Messi and Riquelme, ensuring that Argentina had no chance to **launch an attack** on goal in the opening minutes of the first half [Google].*

In example (21), the match between two boys' football team is like a battle, because they will fight with each other violently in the Thorpe Cup (USA Vs Germany Combined Events). The two football teams are conceived as two troops in a war. The words *fought* and *battle* in the sentence indicates the intense contest between two football teams. As we know, there is an offensive side and a defensive side in a war. It is similar to the situation in a sport match. In example (22), Nigeria focused on *defending against* Argentine playmakers means that the players of Nigeria football team will try their best to fight back if Argentine playmakers Lionel Messi and Riquelme try to shot a goal. In this example, the Nigeria football team is defensive side, while the Argentina football team seeking to *launch an attack* on goal is viewed as the offensive side.

3.3.2 SPORT STRATEGIES ARE WAR STRATEGIES

War strategies like *shot* and *defense*, etc are often employed in sport situation, because both of these two activities are competitive activities.

(23) *Taiwo's **shot** from the top left of the box skips just wide of the far post [Google].*
(24) *Messi has wasted little time. He has carved through the Nigerian **defense** twice in just a few minutes [Google].*

The meaning of the war term *shot* is the act of firing a bullet at somebody or something. When this concept is mapped on example (23), it means that Taiwo adopts the strategy of shooting the goal. This sport strategy can be well comprehended via the concrete concept of shooting bullets in a war. *Defense* is another strategy employed in a war. The word *Defense* in example (24) tells us that Nigerian football team has to employ the strategy of defense, since its opponent Argentine football team (Messi is one of the playmakers) is too offensive and powerful.

3.3.3 THE OUTCOME OF SPORT ACTIVITY IS THE OUTCOME OF WAR

There are two consequences of a sport match. One is winning the match; the other is losing the match.

(25) *Argentina **won** the tennis World Team Cup for the fourth time by **beating** the United States 2-1 on clay in Dusseldorf on Saturday [Google].*
(26) *Diego Maradona confronts German fans after Argentian's **defeat** [Google].*

In example (25), Argentina tennis team beat its opponent United States tennis team successful and then becomes the winner of that match. The war terms *win* and *beat* help people understand the outcome of the sport event. Likewise, when the concept of *defeat* is mapped on the example (26), it shows that Argentia football team fails in the match and turns into a loser in the World Cup.

3.3.4 Major theme and mappings

War is cruel, dangerous and full of strategies. Sometimes, possible injuries may occur in a war. The sport is like a war, since strategies are needed and sometimes players might be injured. The only purpose of players engaged in the sport activity is to win the match. The goal of achieving the gold medal in a sport match is similar to the goal of winning a war, since glories will be gained. In order to achieve the gold medal, two teams will spare no effort to compete with each other. The activity process in the sports can be understood in terms of

war terms such as *attack* and *defense*. If one group wishes to achieve the goal, it will constantly attack or shot; while the other group must defend if it does not want to lose its territory. Therefore, the process of achieving the goal in a sport match is not easy, since two groups will attack each other constantly. The players are viewed as defenders who will try their best to protect their own territory just like soldiers protect their country. The outcome of a sport match can be comprehended via war expression *victory* or *defeat*.

According to the analysis above, the mappings from WAR onto SPORT can be concluded as follows:

SPORT IS WAR

Source: WAR   *Target*: SPORT

(a) troops in a war   →groups in a sport event

(b) soldiers   →players

(c) battles   →matches between two groups

(d) commanders leading the troop   →coaches in charge of directing the group

(e) victory in a war   →success in a sport match

(f) defeat in a war   →failure in a sport match

(g) strategies in a war   →strategies in a sport event

These mappings and the major theme above reflect that the structural metaphor SPORT IS WAR does not come into being at random; instead, it is grounded in systematic correlations within people's experience of war. As for soldiers in a war fight for the interests of their countries, players participated in the sport match is fighting for gold medal so as to gain glories for their country. The role of players in a sport match can be understood via the concept of soldiers in a war. The activity process in the sports can also be understood in terms of war terms such as *attack* and *defense*. This result is correlated with the viewpoint proposed by Lakoff and Johnson, since they state that the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR is not arbitrary but grounded in everyday experience and knowledge. People argue all the time in order to get what we want (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 62).

3.4 DISEASE IS WAR

Since a disease includes innumerable chemical processes inside the human body which cannot be seen directly, the source domain of war is often used to structure the concept of fighting a disease. The examples in this category are listed as follows:

3.4.1 CURING A DISEASE IS FIGHTING A WAR

The tough process for a patient to struggle with illness is like a battle. The virus will invade people's body and then stay there. As for the patients, they should constantly fight against illness.

> (27) *Maintaining a good mental health is a vital part of the **fight against** physical disease, and is especially important in long-term or chronic illnesses such as food intolerance [BM1343].*

The war term *fight against* in example above conveys such a meaning to us that the struggle between human body and physical disease is like a war. Maintaining a good mental health is a good way to strike or battle against the disease.

3.4.2 A DISEASE IS AN INVADER OR ENEMY

Diseases or virus are not a part of human body. If they attempts to enter into human body, they are conceptualized as invaders. When the virus pervades in the body, the patient has to resist the disease in order to survive. In this sense, virus or diseases are conceived as enemies who people should fight against.

> (28) *In certain serious blood disorders it can **invade** other parts of the body, such as the lungs or central nervous system, with severe, if not fatal, consequences [ARH 827].*

Disease is the enemy of human body. If a disease invades other parts of the body, it means that the virus of a disease enters into human body successfully and then has a bad influence on human body.

3.4.3 TREATMENT STRATEGIES ARE WAR STRATEGIES

In order to eradicate or wipe out the virus in human body, some strategies should be adopted by the doctors. The abstract treatment strategies can be understood via the concrete concept of war strategies like *bombard* and *attack*.

(29) *The conventional treatment for large tumours, deep within the body, is to **bombard** them with powerful doses of gamma radiation [B7M 854].*
(30) *I knew that both those therapies were designed to **attack** the cancer cells, the rogue cells in the body; what I did not realize was the cost at which they can do it [B19 901].*

In example (29), adopting powerful doses of gamma radiation to treat large tumour is like using powerful weapons to fight against enemy in a battle. The war term *bombard* in the above sentence shows that powerful doses of gamma radiation are used by the doctor in order to wipe out the large tumours in the patient's body. Therefore, the complex way of getting rid of large tumors is better comprehended via the war strategy *bombard*. In example (30), the word *attack* is used to help people understand that therapies are employed to strike down or even kill the cancer cells in the human body.

3.4.4 Major theme and mappings

Typical activities in a war are attacking and defending, which can also apply to illustrate disease. The two opponents involve in a disease are patients and the virus. Patients are similar to people whose land is invaded. The disease are regarded as enemy, while the patients are considered as defending themselves from the attacks by the enemy. Disease, the invading enemy, should be fought against with the weapons of medicine. The process of curing disease is often conceptualized as a battle, since the relationship between a disease and health is just like that of the enemy and land. Soldiers must defeat the enemy to ensure the land will not be invaded, so disease should be cured to guarantee health will not be threatened. Doctors and nurses are soldiers who will take part in fighting enemies of disease. Medicines are weapons used to conquer disease. Ways of treating a disease are similar to strategies employed in a war.

The mappings connect the source domain of WAR and the target domain of DISEASE can be presented as follows:

DISEASE IS WAR

Source: WAR   *Target*: DISEASE

(a) enemy   →disease

(b) soldiers   →doctors and nurses

(c) weapons   →medicine

(d) battleground   →body

(e) winning a war   →curing a disease

20

(f) losing a war   →failing in treatment

(g) strategies in a war   →strategies of treating a disease

Based on the analysis above, we understand that one thing well connects the elements of WAR and the elements of DIEASE is the major theme which is mapped from the source domain WAR to the target domain DISEASE. The process of curing disease is a battle. Disease should be cured to guarantee health will not be threatened just as soldiers should defeat the enemy to ensure the land will not be invaded. As Kövecses (2002: 110) says that each source domain has a particular meaning focus which can be mapped onto the target. The major theme reflects how concrete source domain is used to understand target domain.

3.5 LOVE IS WAR

People are likely to say that one have conquered the other, if one person gets love of his or her lover successfully. Love is often conceptualized as war, which is reflected in our expression of everyday life. Following examples reflect the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS WAR.

3.5.1 CONFLICTS IN LOVE ARE BATTLES IN A WAR

Undoubtedly, conflicts often occur in love or marriage, so the fights or contradictions between husband and wife or lovers can be viewed as battles in a war.

(31) *Acute marriage **conflict** occurs to all kinds of people [CGE 2063].*

In this example, marriage is conceptualized as a war. Many conflicts or fights between husband and wife in a marriage are like battles carried out in a war. The aim of the fight between husband and wife is to let one person to accept the other's idea or opinion, which is the similar to a war. The basic purpose of a war is to let one country obedient to another one.

3.5.2 THE CONSEQUENCE OF LOVE IS THE CONSEQUENCE OF WAR

Just as the outcomes of a war, people might be win the love or lose the love.

(32) *It was a year since her wedding, and on that bright cold morning she **won** over her husband's family and so persuade him back to her [GW8 2243].*

The word *win* in the example above indicates that the woman succeeds in gaining the support from her husband's family. She wins the love of her husband's family.

3.5.3 Major theme and mappings

War and love share many similarities. People fight for territory, country etc in a war, while people also fight to get the love and affection of the sweetheart. The person who pursues the beloved can be corresponded to the attackers in a war. If another pursuer appears in midway, this pursuer will be regarded as opponent or enemy who should be wiped out. In the end, one of them wins and the other is defeated. People will use strategies to deal with the relationship, such as *attack, invasion,* and *defense*, which is the same with the situation in a war. Sometimes, we often regard person we love as an opponent in that problems or conflicts will come up as each person has his or her own family, interest, friends, opinions, etc. Lovers should also use tactics or skills to gain more respect or understanding from the other to solve the issues together. Lakoff and Johnson propose the similar idea that the verbal conflicts between husband and wife are comprehended in much the same terms as physical battles. Husband and wife are both attempting to get what each of them wants, such as getting the other to accept a certain viewpoint on some issue or at least to act according to that viewpoint (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 62).

According to the analysis above, the mappings connect the domain love and the domain war can be summarized as follows:

LOVE IS WAR

Source: WAR   *Target*: LOVE

(a) attackers in a war   →pursuers in love

(b) battles in a war   →competition between pursuers in love/ conflicts between lovers

(c) winning a war   →succeeding in getting love

(d) losing a war   →failing in getting love

(e) strategies in a war   →skills adopted in love

These mappings help people understand how the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS WAR works and why war terms are often used in love. Though LOVE and WAR are two different things, LOVE is partially structured, understood, performed and talked about in terms of WAR. Just as George Lakoff and Mark Johnson point out that arguments and wars are different kinds of things-verbal discourse and armed conflict; however, a portion of the conceptual network of WAR partially characterizes the concept of ARGUMENT (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 5).

4. Conclusions

The present study gives an analysis of the metaphorical use of war terms from the perspective of cognitive linguistics. Through the detailed discussion, it can be concluded that war terms are widely used in English everyday language. The source domain of war is applied to many aspects of people's life.

On the basis of chapter three, all the examples with metaphorical use of war terms are presented and classified into five major target domains. Five major conceptual metaphors are figured out, that is, POLITICS IS WAR; BUSINESS IS WAR; SPORT IS WAR; DISEASE IS WAR and LOVE IS WAR. To know conceptual metaphor is to know the systematic mappings between a source and a target, so major theme and mappings between the source domain WAR and each target domain are concluded in this study.

These five conceptual metaphors mentioned above are not employed arbitrarily, because mappings between source domain of war and other target domains are grounded in people's everyday knowledge and experience. The basic knowledge of war is its fierce fighting between two participants or groups, which is mapped onto all these five target domains. The meaning of war terms such as *battle*, *battleground*, *army* and *soldiers* differs if they are mapped onto different aspects. In politics, armies are parties, and soldiers are politicians. Battles are conceived as debates between two politicians or parties. In business, armies are companies, while soldiers are businessmen. Battles are conceptualized as price competition. In the target domain of sport, armies are groups, and soldiers are players. Battles are matches between two groups. On the contrary, the meaning of some other war terms like *win*, *lose* and *strategy* remains the same when these terms are used in different situations. The outcomes of political election, business competition, sport, disease and love are well comprehended via war term *win* and *lose*. Therefore, war metaphors contribute a great deal to the conceptualization of different kinds of concepts including politics, business, sport, disease and love in English.

In this study, major themes and mappings of each conceptual metaphor help people understand how war metaphors work in different target domains in English everyday language.

References

Primary material

British National Corpus. (2010) [online] Available from World Wide Web: http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/ [Accessed November 2010].

Google. (2010) [online] Available from World Wide Web: http://www.google.com/ [Accessed November 2010].

Wikipedia. (2010) *Category: Military terminology* [online] Available from World Wide Web: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Military_terminology/ [Accessed November 2010].

Knowgramming. (2010) [online] Available from World Wide Web: http://knowgramming.com/war_metaphors.htm/ [Accessed November 2010].

Secondary material

Kövecses, Z. (2002) *Metaphor: a practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, G & Johnson, M. (2003) *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G & Johnson, M. (1980) Conceptual Metaphor in Everyday Language. *The Journal of Philosophy, Vol. 77, No. 8*, pp. 453-486.

Lakoff, G & Johnson, M. (1999) *Philosophy in the Flesh: the Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.

Lakoff, G. (1993) The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In Ortony, A. (1993) *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liendo, P. (2001) *Business Language : A Loaded Weapon? War Metaphors in Business* [Online]. Available from World Wide Web: http://redalyc.uaemex.mx/pdf/877/87740605.pdf [Accessed: November 2010].

Marc N, B. (2006) *War Metaphors: How President's Use the Language of War to Sell Policy*. Oxford, Ohio: Miami University.

Philip, E. (2000) *A War of Words in the Discourse of Trade*. United States of America: Southern Illinois University.

Ungerer, F. & Schmid, H. (2001) *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistic*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Yang F.P. (2009) *War Metapor in Sports News Reporting*. [Online]. Available from World Wide Web: http://acad.cnki.net/Kns55/brief/Result_CMFD.htm/ [Accessed: November 2010].