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**INTRODUCTION**

The master’s thesis studies the lexical and stylistic means of designating armed conflicts in English Internet news.

Numerous armed conflicts in local wars, terrorist attacks, expansive hybrid warfare and international crime marked the beginning of the XXI century, and after the twin towers attacks in September 2001 the world, according to the US security experts, “will never gravitate towards stability again” [43, p. 4]. These events are widely discussed by the English-speaking media all over the world. Linguistically, media coverage of armed conflicts is studied as a text or discourse type with its own genre and style peculiarities [38, р. 42]. Striking are its lexical features, as professional military vocabulary whose function is limited to specialized military discourse appears to be used in media texts aimed at mass, and often commonplace, audience. Military vocabulary includes terminology, i.e. words used in connection with military concepts, and emotionally coloured elements of the military vocabulary, which in most cases are stylistic synonyms of the corresponding military terms [2, p. 16]. Being used along with general and even colloquial lexical units, and various lexical innovations, the military vocabulary acquires a new function in news texts – shaping public views on particular armed conflicts.

The study of linguistic means designating armed conflicts in news discourse is **topical** because news shape our perception of war involving some recurrent conceptual metaphors that govern our thoughts and language functioning.

The **aim** of this work is to investigate the use of lexical means of designating armed conflicts in English Internet news texts.

The paper is intended to solve the following **tasks**:

– to analyse definitions of military vocabulary;

– to define structural peculiarities of military vocabulary;

– to identify the role of military vocabulary in Internet news;

– to analyze lexical units model people, actions and settings of armed conflicts in English news texts;

–to explain how particular lexical units shape the readers’ perception of war involving conceptual metaphors that govern language functioning.

The **object** of the research is verbal representation of armed conflicts in the news.

The **subject matter** is lexical units referring to people, actions and settings of armed conflicts in news articles.

The **material** of the research is 60 articles taken from the international news websites *bbc.com*. *theguardian.com*, *independent.co.uk*, *washingtonpost.com, newsweek.com* and *euronews.com*. Such choice of resources ensures the balanced account of armed conflicts, as the websites cover international context – British, American, and European.

**The hypothesis** of the research is that in Internet news texts military vocabulary acquires a different function – shaping the readers’ view on particular armed conflicts – due to its use in the expressions based on recurring conceptual metaphors.

The study draws on the following **methods** to investigate the problem under consideration: *definition approach* to define terms relevant to the topic; *component analysis* to identify semantic features in the meaning of lexical units; *contextual analysis* to analyze Internet newsstories about armed conflicts, *conceptual metaphor approach* for explicating cognitive background of language use.

**The novelty** of the research consists in demonstrating that today’s armed conflicts are depicted in the news as taking place not between two armies, but between countries, their governments and the whole communities. Their participants are represented as the Aggressors, the Defenders and the Victims. The conflicts are depicted as a series of destructive and defending actions designated by the corresponding verbs, nouns and adjectives. The most common metaphors revealed in this study are WAR IS A GAME and COUNTRY IS HOME.

**The discussion** of the work was conducted at the I International scientific and practical conference for young researchers “Сучасна іншомовна освіта: когнітивно-дискурсивні та лінгво-дидактичні дослідження” (Nizhyn, September 24-25, 2020); at the meetings of the Germanic Philology and Foreign Languages Instruction Methods Department in 2019-2020.

The results of the research are revealed in the article [47] **published** in the journal “Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Серія: Філологія”(2020, № 45) indexed by *Copernicus International*.

**Theoretical value** of the research is defined by its contribution to lexicology (making semantic classifications of words, developing the theory of meaning), stylistics (analyzing conceptual metaphor, studying functional styles and text genres, and making the stylistic differentiation of vocabulary), and discourse studies (explaining the discourse of news, Internet discourse).

**Practical value** consists in the possibility of using its results in the normative course of lexicology (topic ‘The Theory of meaning’), stylistics (topic ‘Parts of speech’) and in special courses on linguistic text analysis and of interpreting news texts and in writing research papers.

**The total volume** of the paper is 62 pages. The **structure** of the paper includes introduction, two chapters with conclusions, general conclusions, lists of references and dictionaries, appendices and abstracts in English and Ukrainian.

In the **Introduction** the topicality of the chosen theme is substantiated, the aim, the tasks, the object, the subject, the material, the methods of the research and theoretical and practical value of its results are described.

**The first chapter** «Theoretical foundations of studying military vocabulary in English» suggests the definition of military vocabulary in English, its structural peculiarities and approaches to classification – semantic and functional. Moreover, it reveals the features of English Internet news featuring armed conflicts.

**The second chapter** «Functions of lexical units designating armed conflicts in English Internet news texts» is dedicated to the analysis of the linguistic means of representing armed conflicts in English Internet news. Lexical units designating armed conflicts are classified into three groups: nouns and nominal phrases referring to participants of the conflicts, verbs and nouns stating their actions, phrases describing the setting in which the armed conflicts take place. Conceptual metathors underlying their meaning are explained.

In **general conclusions** the results of the investigation are summed up and explained.

The **Bibliography** of the work comprises a list of 72 items – 63 theoretical sources and nine dictionaries.

**PART ONE**

**THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF STUDYING MILITARY VOCABULARY IN ENGLISH**

The vocabulary of any language can be divided into *general* including words that are used in any type of discourse and *special*pertaining to words of restricted use including dialectal words, jargon and special (professional) vocabulary [11, p. 64]. Military vocabulary belongs primarily to the second group, i.e. so-called vocabulary for specific purposes [28; 57]. However, its use is not limited to military discourse only.Whenever military operations are conducted, they are discussed extensively in the media where this type of vocabulary performs different functions. In this part, we will define military vocabulary and single out its strata, describe structural peculiarities of military vocabulary, dwell on the approaches to its classification and identify the role of military vocabulary in Internet news texts.

* 1. **Military vocabulary: Definition and strata**

The term*military* originates from French *militaire* and Latin *militaris*which literally means *relating to soldiers*, since the Latin root *milit-/ miles*means *soldier*[69]. This word entered English language and use in the 15th century as a noun and denoted a country’s armed forces collectively, or the people who are in charge of them like air power, army officers [68].

Military as an adjective developed its meaning later in the 16th century and is defined as relating to soldiers, arms or war: *military discipline, the country's military needs, military affairs, military operations, a military government, the military academy at West Point*[70]. In another meaning, this adjective denotes ‘used by, involving, or relating to the army, navy, or air force’, e.g. *a military helicopter, military equipment* [69].

Synonyms for *military* as an adjective are *martial, soldierly* [70].Synonyms for *military* as a noun are the lexical items *armed forces, colors, service,* and *troops* [ibid.].

Despite the considerable work of scientists in the field of military vocabulary, the issue of the functioning of the military lexicon, its modification in the system of changes, as well as the appearance of neologisms, slang and other innovations, in particular their chronological limits, or, conversely, the loss of primary significance remain relevant to research.

Military vocabulary as one of the oldest professional subsystems of lexicon has its own peculiarities of development and functioning. Understanding the process of the origin and development of the international English military vocabulary, which at various stages reflected the conceptual basis of the military sphere, was reflected in linguistic studies. N. Yatsenko, for instance, notes that military vocabulary is a set of mono industry and polyproprietary special names, which correspond to the concepts and realities of the military sphere and form the corresponding professional subsystem [19, p. 17].

According to V. Balabin, military vocabulary is a kind of vocabulary for specific purposes, because of its restricted communicative and functional orientation; it is at the intersection of two functional language styles - the official language and the scientific and technical [2, p. 254]. It is official due to its use in the official situations – trainings and military and peacekeeping operations, and it is scientific-technical since it pertains to the domain strictly standing out from the others – military.

According to I Lytovchenko, "military vocabulary" is a broader concept than "military terminology", because military vocabulary contains its own military terms, as well as that part of the common vocabulary, which does not always have military significance, but can function in a military context [13, p. 21]. And this peculiarity enables using military lexicon in other genres and text types, such as news, film, fiction etc.

In modern lexicology, the term "military vocabulary" refers to a set of mono-industry and poly-industry special names that correspond to concepts and realities of the military sphere and form the corresponding formation [16, p. 32; 18, p. 4]. The formation of the military subsystem reflects the process of language development, its modification as a whole. The formation of the military vocabulary is closely linked to the evolution of military affairs, caused by the socio-historical progresses in the communities (extra-linguistic factors), subordinated to inter-language laws and interlanguage contacts (intra-lingual factors) [18, p. 20].

The most powerful extra-linguistic factors influencing the development of the studied groups of military vocabulary are technological, historical, political and social-communicative aspects [19, p. 22]. The specificity of the formation of military vocabulary as a subsystem of the literary language reflects the dominant type of thinking, the development of the material world in the conceptual structure of nominations, the linguistic and political priorities of groups of nominative units, political, cultural and other conditions for the development of the language [13, p. 46].

The basis of the classifications of military vocabulary is lexical-semantic, derivative and functional criteria [7, p. 6].

***The lexico-semantic approach*** we employ in our research involves the delineation of semantic groups for the association of military vocabulary to denote general concepts, objects, processes, properties, etc.

***The derivation criterion*** is related to the differentiation of lexical-grammatical classes of words and the discovery of productive models.

Taking into account ***the functional criterion***, in scientific sources, systemic groups of lexical units are distinguished in view of the scope of their functioning in the general lexical-semantic field.

Military vocabulary contains military terminology which includes scientific and technical terms related to military concepts, as well as sub-standard units that characterize the field of unofficial professional communication of military and are stylistic synonyms of military terms [2, p. 36].

The composition of modern military vocabulary is not stable. It is constantly changing due to the outdatedness of some words, the change of meaning, the addition of new terms in connection with the reorganization of the types of armed forces, the emergence of new models of weapons and military equipment, new methods of warfare [7, p. 10].

Military sub-standard vocabulary is used closely with the general literary lexicon. Due to the transfer of the value of commonly used words, lexical units that belong to the field of unofficial professional communication of the military are formed, have common signs and operate in accordance with the general laws. The military sub-standard vocabulary is characterized by the important role of the connotative component and the presence of the expressive-emotional-evaluative element [2, p. 183]. Within the studied lexico-semantic groups, we distinguish the minimal semantic associations (subgroups) constructed on the paradigmatic relations of synonymy, antonymy, hyponomy, and the like.

* 1. **Structural peculiarities of military vocabulary**

Before we start analysing military vocabulary, we should pay attention to the structural features of English words according to their morphological structure [23, p. 29].

Definitely, according to the morphological structure English words can be devided into the following basic types:

1. Simple words, or root – words which are morphologically indivisible; e.g. an armor /ˈɑː.mər/ - броня
2. Derived words, which consist of one root and one or more derivational affixes; e.g. *ammunition* /ˌæm.jəˈnɪʃ.ən/ - боєприпаси
3. Compound words, which consist of two or more stems; e.g. gunpowder /ˈɡʌnˌpaʊ.dər/ - порох
4. Compound-derivatives; e.g. *grenade launcher* /ɡrəˈneɪd/ /ˈlɔːn.tʃər/ - гранатомет

It is widely accepted that new vocabulary(including military vocabulary) items in Modern English belong only to the notional parts of speech, to be more exact, only to nouns, verbs and adjectives; of these nouns are most numerous.

The specificity of term creation in the terminology of military affairs is, according to V. N. Shevchuk, in the preponderance of nouns, because the main function of the military term - ***nominative-definitive***, that is, the naming and definition of a special concept, which is regulated within the defined limits by the definition [18, p. 9]. Derived military terms are created a broad base of derivatives. Terminological phrases such as one-striper, which is one of the specific features of military terminology, can be used as derivatives. The specificity of this derivation process is that the affix joins the units structurally more complex than the word. The difficulty lies only in determining the status of such entities. Taking into account their semantic, syntactic and morphological integrity, V. N. Shevchuk distinguishes them, like A.I. Smirnitsky, into words (terms) of complex derivative type [18, p. 12].

Many industries have their own technical jargon. However, there may be perhaps no other industry in the world that matches up with the amount of specific speech as that possessed by the military. Specifically the U.S. military uses many unique items and concepts that civilians aren’t exposed to. Because of this and the need for expedient, clear communication, service members are immersed in a linguistic world apart from the daily life of a civilian. Some are self-explanatory and others are completely cryptic, but they each have a specific and important meaning.For example, *a bird* is a slang word for a helicopter, *an 11 Bullet Catcher* or *a Bang-Bang* refers to an Army infantryman. Some words may seem controversial, such as *an ass* – it refers to the armored vehicles such as strykers and tanks [70]. Some of the military phrases include pejorative elements, such as *bullshit bomb* or *bitching Betty*.

*Bullshit Bomb* refers to a package intended to disperse propaganda leaflets. The phrase *Bitching Betty* denotes most U.S. military aircraft feature warning systems that frequently use female voices. The phrase is derived from the same anthropomorphe many apply to GPS units in cars, only Bitching Betty alerts pilots to life-threatening situations [68].

Some other widespread military slang words include:

40 Mike-Mike – An M203 grenade launcher, usually mounted under an M-16 or similar weapon.

Air Picket – Any airborne system tasked with detecting, reporting, and tracking enemy aerial movements within a certain area of operation.

Anymouse – A lockbox on Navy ships where sailors may drop anonymous suggestions.

Ate-Up – Describes a service member who follows regulations so closely that they disregard the context of the situation. Conversely, may describe a service member who doesn't understand regulations at all.

Band-Aid – A Vietnam-era term for a medic.

Big Voice – Term used to describe the loudspeaker on a military base. The Big Voice warns of everything from incoming attacks to scheduled ordnance disposal.

'Black' on ammo, fuel, water, etc. – A common phrase which denotes that a particular resource is gone.

Blowed up – The state of being hit by an IED.

Bolo – A derogatory remark for recruits who cannot pass marksmanship training. The idea being that if one cannot use a rifle, one most resort to a bolo.

Bone – A B-1 bomber.

Bullwinkle Badge – Another name for the Air Assault Badge.

Burn Bag – A bag used to hold shredded documents, designed to be burned. May also refer to a useless person.

* 1. **Approaches to classification**

The formation of holistic scientific notions about the systematic organization of military vocabulary is impossible without identifying the specificity of its paradigmatic ties. The discovery of the systematic organization of military vocabulary can be carried out in different directions and on the basis of differential criteria. The problem of the typology of military vocabulary as a professional subjective was not ignored either by domestic or foreign linguists. However, its composition and structure are ambiguously evaluated in linguistics. The most controversial are two interrelated problems: 1) the semantic composition of the studied thematic field; 2) the boundaries of the outlined thematic class of vocabulary in the functional aspect[8].

* + 1. **Semantic approach**

The approach to studying the professional subsystem, as well as the language as a whole, through the lexical-semantic aspect allows us to demonstrate in a compact and evident manner the dynamics of the subsystem, the specifics of its formation, and, consequently, the possibilities of neoplasms incorporated therein.

The lexico-semantic criterion is used to describe the specific components of the whole military submessage as well as its individual branches. According to this criterion, in the military vocabulary there are certain ***semantic groups*** that combine lexical units to denote general concepts, objects, processes, properties, etc. These semantic groups are usually referred to as ***semantic fields***, or lexico-semantic fields.

**A semantic field** is a lexical set of words grouped semantically, i.e. according to their meaning, referring to a specific subject [37, p. 14].In our study this subject is armed conflicts. Brinton calls semantic field a semantic domain with reference to the notion of hyponymy. He writes: "The notion of a semantic field, or domain, is related to the concept of hyponymy, but these connections are loosely defined. A semantic domain covers a segment of reality designated by a set of words related in meaning. The words in a semantic field share a common semantic property" [23, p. 112].

A general description of the vocabulary groupings consists in the fact that the words in a semantic field are not necessarily synonymous, but they are all used to talk about the same general phenomenon [20, p. 239] While synonymy requires that the words share a particular semantic feature or a seme, the semantic field is a larger area including more words – the general terms such as *violence, conflict, crime* and the specific instantiations of them like s*hootings, murder, killing* etc. Crucially, the meaning of a word depends partly on its relation to other words in the same conceptual area [ibid., p. 41]

The kinds of semantic fields vary from culture to culture and researcher use them to study socio-cultural beliefs and account for the differences in reasoning and categorization of various phenomena across different cultural groups [20, p. 239].

Andersen identifies the traditional usage of "semantic field" theory as the following:

"Semantic fields have been traditionally used for comparing and contrasting the lexical structure of different languages and different states of the same language" [21, p. 327].

Researchers of military vocabulary consider it, differentiating vocabulary classes, subclasses, conceptual fields, thematic groups within the lexical-semantic system of language in general. In this lexical-semantic approach, military vocabulary is largely a part of different thematic groups. For example, G. Buch differentiates the military vocabulary into three main thematic groups:

1) "Army as an instrument of the state";

2) "Army as a social institution";

3) "Arms and Equipment of the Army".

The thematic group "Arms and Equipment of the Army" contains two large subgroups:

1) "Armament of the Army";

2) "Technical equipment of the Army".

Each of these subgroups is represented by several thematic microgroups. So, in the subgroup "Arms of the Army", military scientists and strategists identify the following thematic microgroups:

* “Small arms”;
* “Field artillery”;
* “Rocket systems, means of air defense”;
* “Parts of firearms”;
* “Characteristics of firearms”;
* “Ammunition”;
* “Executing the shot”;
* “Explosion”.

The subgroup "Army technical equipment" combines the following thematic microgroups, such as:

* “Ground and underground structures”;
* “Fighting helicopters”;
* “Tactical Aviation”;
* “Armored vehicles”;
* “Submarine ships and submarines”;
* “Military Cars”;
* “Combat characteristics of weapons systems”;
* “Means of providing combat operations”;
* “Radiotechnical means (reconnaissance, television, navigation, locating, communication, electronic suppression)”;
* “Chemical and Biological Weapons”.

The methodological basis of the lexical-semantic field of branch vocabulary is a complex system analysis. It enables the consideration of a professional submessage as a holistic system containing a number of subordinate microsystems, each of which consists of interrelated, interconnected system elements [9, p. 44].

***Classification of the names of military structures***

Today, the names of military structures, integrating into other areas of society's life, become an important means of linguistic representation of objects not related to military affairs, sometimes acquire the status of branch vocabulary.

Features of the semantic field "THE NAMES OF WEAPONS"

The choice of the study of the groups of words "Names of weapons", "Names of ammunition", "Names of buildings" due to the fact that, firstly, military vocabulary belongs to the widely used spheres of vocabulary, and secondly, is an active layer of vocabulary and is characterized by dynamism and various semantic processes to a greater extent than other groups of military vocabulary, which enables to study semantic and derivative changes in the structure of the words of these lexical-semantic groups more deeply.

To the lexical-semantic group "Names of weapons" belong tokens semantically related to the names of types of weapons, military equipment, its auxiliary mechanisms (machines, devices, apparatus, equipment and parts thereof), ammunition and their parts, that is, the hypersemic advocates "kind of weaponry".

LSG contains subgroups: "firearms", "cold weapons", "ammunition", "military equipment". The structure of LSG has a field character, contains a center with its kernel and periphery. The main criteria for the isolation of nuclear lexical units are chronological resistance, universality, stylistic neutrality, ambiguity, non-appearance, morphological simplicity, developed polysemy, high frequency of use, a wide range of synonymic connections, and powerful word-formation potential [5, p. 22].

Polysemy in the lexical-semantic group "weapons names" is one of the productive means of enriching and organizing military vocabulary. L. Lisychenko observes that in the polysemy paradigmatic relations of the meanings of the word available in the language structure are realized, and the polysemantic word is a microsystem with a clear organization of the constituent parts [6, p. 25].

LEXICO-SEMANTIC FEATURES OF LSG "AMBASSADOR'S NAMES"

The lexico-semantic group "Names of Ammunition" contains lexemes that are semantically related to the names of things (except clothing and weapons) that make up the equipment of a serviceman, as well as military equipment of the horse [7, p.27].

The names of ammunition in the LSG are divided into subgroups: "the name of the warrior's protective equipment", "the names of the equipment for the storage of weapons", "the name of the horse-outfit".

LEXICO-SEMANTIC FEATURES OF LSG "NAMES OF STRUCTURES".

The lexico-semantic group "Names of Structures" contains sub-groups: "the names of military structures, special purpose premises and their parts", "the names of fortifications". The names of fortification structures are differentiated by micro-groups: "the names of field fortifications" and "the names of long-term fortifications".

Thenamesofmilitarystructures

Namesoffortifications

Namesofspecialpurposestructures

Longterm

Field

**Scheme 1**: The names of military structures

So, the semantic approach to classifying military vocabulary consists in singling out various semantic groups. This is useful in our research because apart from synonymic groups it includes words of different levels of generalization – hyperonyms and hyponyms.

* + 1. **Functional approach**

One of the criteria for the differentiation of military lexis is functional which presupposes singling out of systemic groups of lexical units depending on the sphere of functioning in the general corpus of "Military vocabulary". Functional approach emphasizes the way spoken and written language operate indifferent social situations. In particular, it is very useful in showing how texts work beyond the level of the sentence, how different texts are structured, and how language varies to suit the purpose of the users. It takes on a descriptive approach and focuses on groups of words that function to make meanings.

Classification of military vocabulary on the basis of a functional criterion used by many scholars, allows the division of words in broad, or general, military vocabulary and narrow, or scientific, groupings. For example, A. Kolgushkin differentiates the military vocabulary on the principle of the degree of functional limitation and distinguishes in the composition of military vocabulary into special, restricted to military only spheres and activities, and general usages found in other discourses [10, p. 66]. And O. Kozhin believes that, in addition to military terms, general scientific terms and expressions, the term "military vocabulary" also includes nomenclature marks and professionalism [11, p. 7-8].

The basis for the classification of military vocabulary by other researchers is the principle of using lexical units in the language of the military. Every text(or actually everything that is said or written) unfolds in some context of use according to which the vocabulary is divided into the following components:

1) military special vocabulary (terminology and nomenclature), covering the whole set of different military terms;

2) military nonterminal vocabulary, to which various belong social-functional classes of words used in professional military communication. These are emotionally painted elements of military vocabulary, which are mostly stylistic synonyms of the corresponding military terms. This class includes professionalism, jargon, slang of military, indicated in special dictionaries [12; 13, p. 59; 14, p. 18; 15, p. 7; 16, p. 12].

The distinction between terminology and non-terminology of the military vocabulary, limited or unlimited in relation to use in the professional military sphere, is objectively complex and controversial. That is why in linguistics there is no unity about the functional differentiation of military vocabulary.

A functional approach is essentially ‘natural’ in the sense that everything in it can be explained by reference to the real-life situations and how language is used in it. In this sense, the fundamental components of meaning in language are functional components. According to the analysis of M. Halliday, all languages are organized around two kinds of meanings:

* the ‘ideational’ (to understand the environment),
* the ‘interpersonal’ (to act on the others in it).

Combined with these two is a third component, the ‘textual’, which is relevant to the other two. In this third sense, each element in a language is explained by reference to its function in the total linguistic system. Accordingly, a functional approach is one that construes all the units of a language – its clauses, phrases and so on. In other words, each part is interpreted as functional with respect to the whole” [39, p. xiv].

Using M. Halliday’s model, Thompson (1996) explains the three functional aspects of language use in an informal way as follows:

1) we use language to talk about our experience of the world, including the world in our minds, to describe events and states and the entities involved in them.

2) We also use language to interact with other people, to establish and maintain relation with them, to influence their behavior, to express our own viewpoint on things in the world, and to elicit or change theirs.

3) Finally, in using language, we organize our messages in ways which indicate how they fit in with the other messages around them and with the wider context in which we are talking or writing.

These ideas are important for our study in the way that we do not deal with military vocabulary in the military sphere directly, but we analyze news texts which only represent armed conflicts.

* 1. **Representation of armed conflicts in the news**

Understanding and linguistic representation of armed conflicts are based on the idea of violence, which implies destroying everything from, people, crops, infrastructures and other material resources to institutions, including education, and political will, hope, and trust. Armed conflicts are the root cause of poverty, which causes suffering, is disastrous for economic development and deprives people from their basic needs and life quality. The role of language is crucial in representing armed conflicts, because it shapes people’s perception, understanding and attitudes, and secondly, it may play a great role in conflict management either solving the conflict, or evolving it to greater measure.

**1.4.1. Internet news texts**

**News** is a piece of information represented by mass media about recent events in the country or worldwide or in a particular area of activity [38, p. 132]. This definition brings into the focus the novelty of events or situations described in the articles. But along with its informative function, news stories play an essential role in shaping the viewpoints and general ideas of the readership, or as J.Roberts puts it, “We know what is happening in a foreign country without traveling there, and develop a particular opinion about a public figure – a politician, a celebrity, an activist etc. – without actually meeting the person” [54, p. 24].

The element of novelty is a basic building block of a news story. Every news story contains the answer to six questions: *Who? What? When? Where? Why? How?* Answers to these questions may be represented by photos, videos, audios or by textual elements of news stories [59, p. 43].

There is a fixed, conventional structureof news stories comprisingtypical news discourse categories. Each category must correspond to a specific sequence of sentences of the text. The order of categories also determines the overall ordering of the respective sequences or episodes [30, p. 21].

Traditionally, the first structural category of news stories consists of *the Headline* and *the Lead* functioning as a summary for the full text, and therefore they are grouped together under the higher level category of *Summary* [30, p. 43-46]. Other well-known news categories are *Background* and *quotations*, which are called *Verbal Reactions*. They usually introduce the preceding events and general situations relevant for the story and suggest people’s evaluations of them. The next categories of news structure that dominate are *History, Main Event*, *Previous Events*, *Consequences*, optional is the category of *Comments.* Finally, there is the category *of Context* covering all the information in the news report about the actual situation in which the main news event takes place [ibid., p. 47].

The ordering of the categories also determines the distribution of information in the text, such as the sequential realization of topics. Some of the ordering principles are straightforward. Thus, *Summary* (*Headline and Lead*) always comes first, and *Comments* mostly last. Most news stories start with *Main Event* after the *Summary*. Next, various background categories may appear in the text, such as *History* or *Context. Previous Events* and *Context* are closer to the *Main Events* and therefore should preferably follow the *Main Event* category [30, p. 51].The structure of the news story helps the reader to organize information in memory, which is a primary condition for its better recall and use. If news structure is professionally known and shared it also will facilitate production of news [30, p.53].

Armed conflicts are represented in the news as taking place not between two armies, but as most devastating on-going conflicts involving many countries. Furthermore, they are often depicted as taking place in countries undergoing major political changes, such as countries that have taken steps towards democratisation [24, p. 12]. In other words, today’s news replaced major demonstration of two superpowers and the acceleration of technological advancements in the army and battle grounds and discuss armed conflicts through the periscope of political communication. Full-scale nuclear war seems in the news less of a threat today, but instead smaller, particularly vicious and more difficult to solve, armed conflicts that to a higher degree implicate civilians as combatants and as victims are represented as posing the biggest threat [38, p. 131].

In the news today, democracy is heralded as prime mechanism for societal development and conflict management. Most importantly is the realisation that any attempt to promote peace and prevent violent conflict requires active participation, including all societal actors, a multilateral approach and long-term commitments [42, p. 16].

As media initiatives in conflict management continue to increase, so does the need for a more comprehensive and global understanding of this aspect and conflict management [49, p. 189]. Understanding how the media works and the dynamics of armed conflict are both complex and important issues. It is essential to develop this knowledge because; intertwined, political conflict dynamics and the media create a distinct domain of consequences and opportunities [50, p. 61]. Unfortunately, although relevant experiences and research continue to increase and accumulate, the state of research today concerning this topic is still embryonic. In this, language means play a crucial role.

**1.4.2. Role of military vocabulary in Internet news texts**

Numerous armed conflicts in local wars, terrorist attacks, expansive hybrid warfare and international crime marked the beginning of the XXI century, and after the twin towers attacks in September 2001 the world, according to the US security experts, “will never gravitate towards stability again” [43, p. 4]. These events are widely discussed by the English-speaking media all over the world.

Linguistically, media coverage of armed conflicts is studied as a text or discourse type with its own genre and style peculiarities. Striking are its lexical features, as professional military vocabulary whose function is limited to specialized military discourse appears to be used in media texts aimed at mass, and often commonplace, audience. Military vocabulary includes terminology, i.e. words used in connection with military concepts, and emotionally coloured elements of the military vocabulary, which in most cases are stylistic synonyms of the corresponding military terms [2, p. 4]. Being used along with general and even colloquial lexical units, and various lexical innovations, the military vocabulary acquires a new function in news texts – shaping public views on particular armed conflicts.

The military vocabulary in speech communication functions mainly in texts of military subjects and is represented by the general military vocabulary which entered the total speech turnover, military terms and units of informal conversation. Primary use of terminological or colloquial vocabulary depends on extent of social control. Content of social ideas of military subjects at the level of public official consciousness exists in military terms, at the level of public ordinary consciousness in units of military professional vocabulary and military slang.

The military vocabulary serves as a means of exact designation of objects, events, concepts and can significantly raise speech emphasis.

Now, I would like to represent some terms for understanding of English military vocabulary better[17]:

A *missile* - is the most effective for hitting a target far away from you.

A *colonel* -  is the highest-ranked soldier.

*"Boots on the ground"* means that there will be soldiers attacking by land.

When an enemy attacks, an army will try to *repel* it.

*Sanctions*are weapons because they can harm the enemy’s economy.

*Guerrillas* are not like regular army soldiers because they don’t follow standard rules of battle.

The *drill sergeant* is the leader of boot camp.

The difference between a *ceasefire* and a *truce* is the length of time involved.

To explain what is reported in the media, we focus our research majorly on the description of armed conflicts. The peculiarity of the news texts is that targeting at the mass audience they may not provide a clear difference between such specific terms as the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Navy. Also, the semantic difference between the words rockets, missiles, and mortars is not crucial.

Linguistically, lexical units designating armed conflicts involve three groups of lexical means:

1) nouns and nominal phrases referring to participants of the conflicts,

2) verbs and nouns stating their actions, and

3) phrases describing the setting in which the armed conflicts take place.

They will be analyzed in Part two of this work.

**Conclusion on part I**

The vocabulary of any language can be divided into *general* including words that are used in any type of discourse and *special*pertaining to words of restricted use including dialectal words, jargon and special (professional) vocabulary. Military vocabulary belongs primarily to the second group, i.e. so-called vocabulary for specific purposes. However, its use is not limited to military discourse only. Whenever military operations are conducted, they are discussed extensively in the media where this type of vocabulary performs different functions. In this part, we will define military vocabulary and single out its strata, describe structural peculiarities of military vocabulary, dwell on the approaches to its classification and identify the role of military vocabulary in Internet news texts.

Numerous armed conflicts in local wars, terrorist attacks, expansive hybrid warfare and international crime are widely discussed by the English-speaking media all over the world. Linguistically, media coverage of armed conflicts is studied as a text or discourse type with its own genre and style peculiarities. Striking are its lexical features, as professional military vocabulary whose function is limited to specialized military discourse appears to be used in media texts aimed at mass, and often commonplace, audience. Military vocabulary includes terminology, i.e. words used in connection with military concepts, and emotionally coloured elements of the military vocabulary, which in most cases are stylistic synonyms of the corresponding military terms. Being used along with general and even colloquial lexical units, and various lexical innovations, the military vocabulary acquires a new function in news texts – shaping public views on particular armed conflicts.

Military terminology is incredibly flexible. Not only are different military groups and, indeed, different wars characterized by particular vocabularies, military terminology also infiltrates the language of civilians and, conversely, is impacted by a number of specialized civilian vocabularies. Although this information makes no attempt to cover all of the loci of linguistic creativity marked by military terminology and the language of warfare, it offers a snapshot of the ubiquity of military discourse and its clear impact on the development of English vocabulary.

Lexical units designating armed conflicts involve three groups of lexical means: 1) nouns and nominal phrases referring to participants of the conflicts, 2) verbs and nouns stating their actions, and 3) phrases describing the setting in which the armed conflicts take place.

**PART TWO**

**FUNCTIONS OF LEXICAL UNITS DESIGNATING ARMED CONFLICTS IN ENGLISH INTERNET NEWS TEXTS**

News about armed conflicts constantly attracts the readers’ attention and creates the necessary image of the armed conflict and its participants through the use of particular language means. In such texts, lexical items and stylistic devices are generally aimed at forming a specific attitude to the events described in the news texts and evoking readers’ sympathy, support or condemnation [51, p. 60].

This chapter presents the results of our analysis of 60 articles taken from the international news websites *bbc.com*., *theguardian.com*, *independent.co.uk*, *washingtonpost.com, newsweek.com* and *euronews.com*. We have found that that in Internet news texts military vocabulary acquires a different function – shaping the readers’ view on particular armed conflicts – due to its use in the expressions based on recurring conceptual metaphors. So, the discussion will proceed from describing lexical units designating armed conflicts to the conceptual metaphors those units come in.

**2.1. Lexical units designating armed conflicts**

Lexical units designating armed conflicts involve three groups of lexical means:

1) nouns and nominal phrases referring to participants of the conflicts,

2) verbs and nouns stating their actions,

3) phrases describing the setting in which the armed conflicts take place.

**2.2.1. Participants**

The participants of armed conflicts in news articles are named by common and proper nouns and represent three possible roles: the *Aggressor* who threatens people and does harm; the *Victim* who suffers from the Aggressor’s violent actions, and the *Defender* who saves the Victim and ensures global security. The authors’ choice of lexical units and their combination and arrangement in sentences is crucial in identifying these roles in news texts.

**2.2.1.1. Aggressor** is represented in news as the one who posits threat to the others and endangers a particular country, locality or the whole world [6, p. 20].

In the most general way, Aggressor is named by the nouns *dictator* and *tyrant*, which refer to a person who acts despotically and exercises the ultimate power, e.g. *My fellow Americans, a short time ago I ordered the United States armed forces to launch precision strikes on targets associated with the chemical weapons capabilities of Syrian* ***dictator*** *Bashar al-Assad* (bbc.com 14.04.2018). In this example, the noun *dictator* is used with the adjective referring to the nationality *Syrian* and the author provides the names of the aggressor – Syria’ president Bashar-al-Assad. Ascribing president al-Assad the qualities associated with dictatorship, the author evokes in the readers strongly negative attitudes towards him and his country, because the word dictator itself bears in mind a negative image.

The nouns referring to Aggressor are often collocated with evaluative adjectives *violent, rogue, murderous, brutal*, adding still more negative effect in portraying these people, e.g. *The nations of the world can be judged by the friends they keep. No nation can succeed in the long run by promoting rogue states, brutal* ***tyrants****, and murderous* ***dictators*** (bbc.com 14.04.2018).

Besides nouns referring to people, Aggressor is often represented metonymically by the names of countries and states, e.g. *Russia, Pakistan*, organizations and different terrorist groupings, e.g. *ISIS, The Donetsk People’s Republic* etc., e.g. ***Taliban*** *kills 20 Pakistani soldiers* (independent.co.uk 19.01.2014). In this example, Taliban, a terrorist group, is represented as an Aggressor actively engaging in not only threatening activity, but open violent crime.

The image of a violent Aggressor is enhanced by depicting the object of his aggression – the greater it is, the more powerful the Aggressor seems [15, p. 55]. The most threatening are those who are represented with the object *world*, e.g. *The United States intends to remain a steadfast partner of Saudi Arabia to ensure the interests of our country, Israel and all other partners in the region. It is our paramount goal to fully eliminate the threat of terrorism throughout* ***the world****!* (bbc.com 20.11.2019) This example shows that the target of Aggressor’s violence is the whole world, which adds him seemingly unstoppable power.

The image of the almighty world-wide Aggressor is created in news texts by the clichés “let’s speak clearly about good and evil” and “it’s necessary to rid the world of evil”. The loses, casualties and damages are described to contribute to the Aggressor’s power, e.g. *world crisis, humanitarian crisis, 20 soldiers killed*. Moreover, by using the lexical units *world’s, global, international, major* etc. the fight represented in the news looks not as the one between two countries (or rather two leaders of the countries), but as the one involving the whole world, e.g., *The program may well be the tip of the spear in the Obama administration’s much touted attempt to make so-called “Countering Violent Extremism” (CVE) initiatives more central to the* ***world’s*** *long-term fight against the terror group also known as ISIS* (The Washington Times 14.09.2017).

By using abstract nouns, substantivized adjectives, e.g. the good, the evil, words that represent hyperonymic relations, e.g. human beings, world, community, news texts reveal the situations which may happen to everyone, which refer to every reader, every nation, e.g. *Looking around our very troubled* ***world****, Americans have no illusions. We cannot purge the* ***world*** *of* ***evil****, or act everywhere there is* ***tyranny*** (bbc.com 14.04.2019). Due to the lexical units *world, evil* and *tyranny*, this sentence embodies the general American idea that any nation can keep themselves to themselves and keep their own isolated peace. As America’s ex-president Barack Obama once claimed, “If peace is disrupted in any distant region, it is disrupted for every nation on the planet, for no one can keep his own peace turning a blind eye to the other places that are in peril.”

Apart from the object world, the grand power of the Aggressor may be enacted by naming multiple objects of violence like in the sentence below:

*The Islamic State and other radical terrorist groups are beheading, crucifying, raping and burning alive human beings in Libya, Syria, Iraq, Yemen and other places* (The Washington Times 23.02.2017). In this sentence the Islamic state is represented as Aggressor exerting strong power – it commits violent crimes against a great number of people of different nations in Libya, Syria, Iraq, Yemen and other places underlined above. And the Aggressor’s violent power is revealed by the predicates *are beheading, crucifying, raping* and *burning*.

Aggressor is not always explicated by the linguistic units. In many news texts, we deal with the so-called **implicit Aggressor** – he is not called by lexical units referring to people or countries etc., rather the results of his aggression are clearly described, e.g. *The humanitarian organization expressed alarm at recent reports of hundreds of civilian* ***casualties*** *and the* ***destruction*** *of hospitals and schools* (bbc.com 14.04.2018). This sentence describes the consequences of aggression – hundreds of civilian casualties and the destruction of hospitals and schools.

Consider the other two examples where the implicit Aggressor affects the Victim and the Defender accordingly:

*American-backed paramilitaries battling the Islamic State terror group in Syria came under attack by an “unknown* ***aggressor****” Friday, a day after Israeli forces launched a massive attack against pro-regime forces in the country* (The Washington Times 11.05.2018).

*On Saturday, a Russian Su-25 Frogfoot attack jet was shot down in Syria by what Russia calls “terrorists” and the U.S. calls “Anti-Assad rebels”* (The Washington Times 4.02.2018).

An implicit Aggressor can also do harm to the whole world, e.g. *ISIS has captivated Western attention for so long with its gruesome beheadings, stabbings, vehicular homicides, shootings and bombings in Europe and the United States, the horrific aftermaths deservedly the focus of television news, that virtually forgotten is the* ***world’s*** *biggest terror threat – Iran’s IRGC, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps* (The Washington Times 16.07.2017).

Hyperonyms such as humanitarian crisis, humanitarian catastrophe, evil, evil doers, etc. which name an Aggressor, his actions or consequences of his violence contribute to the image of ‘Aggressor as global threat’. Such global scale is important pragmatically, since in global context no one claims responsibility and it is possible to divert attention from one issue to another, e.g. *The United Nations will live in infamy for lending its megaphone on Tuesday against Nigeria’s 50 million Igbo people because of their ethnicity ... or terrorized by Nigeria’s military acting under Buhari’s direction in the last week alone. ... assistance from the United States in its global war on terrorism* (The Washington Times 20.09.2017).

**2.2.1.2. Victim** of armed conflict is represented in news as the one who suffers from the Aggressor’s violent actions. The image of Victim is created by appealing to innocence, truthfulness and defenseless which are severely violated by the Aggressor [6, p. 20].

In the analyzed corpus of texts, the idea of Victim as innocent and defenseless is realized on the lexical and morpho-syntactic level [15, p. 55].

**Lexical means** contain the semantic feature of ‘innocence’ and ‘weakness’ in their dictionary definitions. Such words are used nearly in every of the analyzed article and are represented by the verbal and nominal phrases.

The most common pattern of representing victims is **verbal phrases** with the verbs *help, liberate, save, free, defend* + Obj., where the object is the victim. In the examples below, the noun hostages and the proper name Raqqa represent victims

e.g. *Qatar has worked to help free other* ***hostages*** *held by opposition armed groups in Syria, including the American journalist Peter Theo Curtis, who was released by al-Nusra Front in 2014* (bbc.com 23.10.2018).

*It’s a year since the Syran city of* ***Raqqa*** *was freed from the grip of the group known as Islamic State* (bbc.com 22.10.2018).

While the common noun *hostages* names particular persons (and the American journalist among them), the proper noun *Raqqa* represents victim collectively – as a community of citizens in that Syrian city. In view of verbal combinability, the idea of innocence and defenseless comes primarily into focus.

**Noun phrases** with the adjective *innocent* represent people or whole nations who have become the victims of military conflicts. In the sentences below, for instance, the phrases *innocent people* and *thousands of civilians* collocate with the predicates *launched attach* and *has killed* which resonates on the idea of violent deaths of innocent people:

*One year ago, al-Assad launched a savage chemical weapons attack against his own* ***innocent*** *people* (bbc.com 14.07.2019).

*The coalition launched a major air campaign that the UN says has killed thousands of* ***civilians*** *and destroyed critical infrastructure across rebel-held Yemen* (bbc.com 13.06.2018).

Lexical units denoting schools and kindergartens contribute to the creation of the victim’s image as they are associated with the concept of children who need to be protected especially when it comes to bombing or attacking the buildings, e.g. *There have been explosions at a school in the south of the Syrian capital, Damascus, causing casualties, activists and state media say* (bbc.com 12.11.2016). In this example, the target of terror attack is one of the schools in the south of the Syrian capital, Damascus. Children have fallen victim of the deadly explosion. This side of the armed conflict evokes grief and compassion in the readers.

Describing the whole nation as a collective victim in news, the authors use lexical units that emphasize opposition of the conflict participants. In such a way, the relations between the Victim and the Aggressor realize a scenario where these participants are never equalized. There is always a passive Victim and a dominant Aggressor. Depicting the victims as weak, defenseless and passive has a specific pragmatic effect as such representation of reality implicitly reflects the idea of the need for military intervention, since the victims cannot protect themselves.

**2.2.1.3. Defender** is represented in news as the one who saves the Victim and ensures global security. The main feature ascribed to Defender in Internet news discourse is *responsibility* for the whole world and stability in it [6, p. 21].

The most common way to depict the Defender in news is to employ the official names of international organizations, their departments and representatives, e.g. *the UN Security Council, the UN, the UN envoy, western powers*. Such lexical items appeal to strength and authority whom people want to believe and to rely.

Let’s consider the following examples:

*The 71-year-old Italian-Swedish diplomat told* ***the UN Security Council*** *this was for personal reasons* (bbc.com 17.10.2018).

*Instead the US and a handful of other nations say they’re focusing their efforts on “stabilization”. Patrick Connell, a senior* ***US State Department*** *official on the ground, says that means denying the extremists the “fertile ground they can recruit from”* (bbc.com 22.10.2019).

In these examples, the nominative units *the 71-year-old Italian-Swedish diplomat* and *a senior US State Department official Patrick Connell* identify people who belong to the government organizations such as the US security Council and the US State Department that ensure security the rule of law.

To describe the Defender, the authors also use the words *freedom, justice, peace, action, responsibility, military assistance* etc. They create the effect as if the readers are defended, as the Defender is with them, nearby to ensure their security. Such perception happens due to the affective connotation of these words; they appeal to the readers’ positive emotions and evoke the feeling of safety.

The sense of inclusion and belongingness to the secure community where the Defender controls everything is also created by the words *we, country, America, joined forces, military coalition*, because the feeling of being a part of a secure community is the primary need for every citizen of every country. In the example below, there are two phrases that show the union with someone powerful – *cooperating with the U.S.-led military coalition* and *to join forces with Russia’s military*. However, the U.S.-led military coalition is presented as the Defender who saves the world from ISIS, while Russian military forces are presented as working on the part of the Aggressor:

*Rather than cooperating with* ***the U.S.-led military coalition*** *now operating against the Islamic State in Syria, Iraq and other locations, the Chinese military is more likely to join forces with Russia’s military, currently engaged in a large-scale bombing campaign in Syria* (The Washington Times 13.01.2017).

In describing armed conflicts, The Defender’s courageous and responsible actions are presented by the predicates *not to stand idly by, to defend freedom, to show courage* etc. which refer to protection of people and values, seeking truth and being strong and responsible:

e.g. *We will defend our* ***freedom****.*

*We will bring* ***freedom*** *to others.*

 *But the United States of America will not stand idly by in the face of actions that undermine* ***global peace*** *and* ***security***.

In the above examples, the Defender is called *we* and the United States of America and he is involved in the armed conflicts for the sake of American national values, security, freedom and global peace. In such fragments as these, the inclusive pronoun **we** implies the whole American nation.

In news texts, the authors often involve the vocabulary referring to the ***moral*** and ethical side of armed conflicts to describe the Defender, because he is the one who always acts legally, morally and guarantees the rule of law in all aspects. Here we refer such nouns as *freedom, action, responsibility, values, courage, truth* etc. They symbolize the key values of both American and European societies, and therefore they are associated with the description of the Defender.

For example: *Even as the Obama administration calls on nations to secure religious freedoms globally, advocates say the effort would get a boost with more action and leadership from the United States itself* [The Washington Times 29.10.2016]. In this sentence, the Obama administration is presented as the Defender who ensures the security of religious freedoms and the adverbial modifier *globally* intensifies the strength of the Defender.

The Defender’s actions are usually presented as the fight between the good the evil. It creates a particular pragmatic effect, because it looks like the Defender always stands in the face of threat to protect national values. In the analyzed articles we have picked up the following phrases:

*everything what is good and just*

*global peace, world, security, justice*

*universal values, human beings*

By using these words and phrases, the authors of the news texts show that the whole world will be secure, because the Defender seeks for it in the eyes of global readership. This idea is supports everywhere in the texts, because the phrases above often collocate with the words *responsible, help, support* etc.

To conclude, responsibility for the whole world and for the stability in it is the main Defender’s feature which is revealed in the news about armed conflicts. The pragmatic effect of the texts that describe the relations between the Defender, the Victim and the Aggressor is explained by the general presupposition of the texts about armed conflicts – that is the value of freedom, security, responsibility and the rule of law is above all, and these values are above the sovereignty of a particular territory or beliefs of some particular state leaders. In such a way, the global readers get the idea that peace should be global, not local, and that makes it possible for some states, the U.S for example, to intervene in the other nations’ affair to ensure global peace. This can be proved by the following sentence from BBC news: *America is already fulfilling its responsibility by ridding Syria of ISIS* (bbc.com 22.10.2019).

**2.2.2. Actions**

Actions in armed conflicts are named by the verbs and nouns that can be categorized into two groups:

1) Destructive actions targeted at ruining the locality and killing people.

2) Defending actions aimed at maintaining security.

**2.2.2.1. Destructive actions** are described more often in the news, because armed conflicts lead inevitably to destruction of some property, lives and relations.

The results of our analysis show that destructive actions in the armed conflicts are represented as the ones carried out at the local and international level. The scope of destruction is reflected in the meanings of lexical units.

Lexical items representing destructive actions at the **local level** are united by the semantic features ‘*object’* and ‘*disorder of structure or function’* in their meanings [71]. In the analyzed articles, we have found frequent use of the following:

* verbs: *to crash, to smash, to shatter, to ruin, to wreck, to wreak havoc, to harm, to hurt, to injure, to maim*,
* nouns *crash, harm, injury*, *bombing*
* adjectives *intact, badly hurt* etc.

For example: *The window of a Porsche showroom was shattered, the Ritz had paint thrown at it, and Fortnum & Mason was occupied by a sit-in (with little damage done; the stacks of Earl Grey tea and Gentleman’s Relish survived intact)* (Newsweek.com 02.05.2018). This sentence describes the local armed rebellion on London streets with shootings and police fight. The verb *shatter* implies destruction and the phrase *survived intact* shows lack of destruction.

Destructive actions targeting people are represented by the words killed and injured in the following sentence: *The soldiers were on patrol in an armored vehicle near a refugee camp in Juba on Sunday, when a shelling attack* ***killed*** *them and* ***injured*** *six others, according to China’s defense ministry* (bbc.com 11.06.2016).

Destructive actions are revealed by the nouns referring to bombings, shootings etc, e.g. *Iraq’s nuclear program was seriously damaged by Israel’s bombing of the Osirak reactor in June 1981, but Saddam did not give up his quest for powerful weapons* (Newsweek.com 20.12.2017). In the sentence above the noun *bombing* specifies the armed action.

On the hyperonimic level, the nouns *violence* and *crime* refer to destructive actions in armed conflicts. In the following sentence, these nouns designate destructive actions in the most general way:

*His administration had shied away from supporting juke events, for fear any juvenile gathering would promote violence and crime* (Newsweek.com 07.03.2019).

The word *violence* often collocates with the verb *escalate* which proves that the news is focused on the rise of the amount of destructive actions as the following sentence demonstrates:

*As Islamist militant* ***violence*** *escalates France wants the rest of Europe to join the deadly fight* (bbc.com 27.11.2019).

Such words as *violence* and *crime* with the generalized meaning are used when the focus in the sentence not on the violence itself, but on the people and circumstances of the conflict: *More than 13,000 international troops are in Mali to contain violence caused by various* ***armed groups*** *in the north and centre of the country, including* ***jihadists*** *linked to* ***al-Qaeda*** *and* ***the Islamic State group*** (bbc.com 14.062020).

More specific crimes committed in the process of armed conflicts are named by the verbs *to assault*, *to kill* and *to abuse*, also there verbs to name a very particular actions such as *to rape*, *to assassinate* and *to beat (up)*, *to murder*, *to smuggle*, *to take hostages*.

Among the nouns that refer to the destructive actions in armed conflicts we have found a variety of lexical units: *assassination*, *murder*, *kidnapping*, *homicide*, *rape*, *fraud*, *assault*, *forgery*, *robbery*, *smuggling* and *slaughter*. In the following sentence, for example, the nouns *murder* and *assassinations* name violent destructive actions very specifically by hyponyms: *When it comes to strategic murders, the Mossad has established a record 50 years long of “targeted assassinations,” often taking out scientists who tried to help its enemies develop weapons of mass destruction* (euronews.com 20.12.2017).

Lexical items representing destructive actions at the **international level** are united by the semantic features *‘violent action’*and*‘between countries’* in their meanings [71]. In the analyzed articles, we have found frequent use of the following:

* nouns referring to war and international conflicts: *war, warfare, conflict, crisis*
* nouns referring to particular military actions (*shoot*, *attack*), strikes (*strike*, *unrest*, *riot*) і terror attacks (*terrorism, hi-jacking, terror attack, scare tactics*).
* verbs related to international conflicts: *to attack, to bomb*.

Let’s consider the following example:

*The country’s labor unions have already begun squaring up for a showdown, with threats of a coordinated wave of strikes and civil disobedience across Europe* (Newsweek.com 27.09.2018).

In this sentence, destructive actions taking place internationally are named by the phrases *a coordinated wave of strikes* and *civil disobedience*.

**2.2.2.2. Defending actions** are described in the contexts representing the Defenders. These lexical items are united by the semantic features *‘keep’*, ‘*restore’* in their meanings [71].

Similarly to the vocabulary referring to the destructive actions, the words naming defending actions in the armed conflicts are represented as the ones carried out at the local and international level. The scope of destruction is reflected in the meanings of lexical units.

Lexical items representing defending actions at the **local level** are united by the semantic features ‘*object’* and ‘*renovation’* in their meanings [71]. In the analyzed articles, we have found frequent use of the following:

* verbs *rectify, repair, rebuild, amend, renew, recreate* etc.
* nouns *reconstruction, renovation, restoration*, *peace-keeping* etc.

In terms of defending, peacekeeping actions at the local (or subnational) level are widely portrayed in the news. Interestingly, BBC News website even has a separate section which is called *UN Peacekeeping* available at <https://www.bbc.com/news/topics/czp0dgvmjrpt/un-peacekeeping>. With time, this section receives more increasing attention.

Local peacekeeping matters greatly because it reassures local political leaders and officials, deters resumption of armed hostilities, coerces parties to halt fighting, and makes commitment to agreements credible. In such a way, peacekeepers affect the relations between central and local authorities and avoid the emergence of local power gaps and areas without the rule of law.

In our analysis there were above 20 articles about new data on the local deployment of United Nations peacekeepers. The analysis of the vocabulary demonstrates that conflict episodes are represented as lasting shorter when peacekeepers are deployed to conflict locations inside a country, even with comparatively modest deployment. In such a way, the media justify peacekeeping operations. In the next sentence, for example, the journalist describes the situation in a country prior to peacekeeper arrive: *Gunmen raid a military camp in the centre of the country, as witnesses tell of "complete chaos"* (bbc.com 26.06.2020). The lexical units*gunmen raid* and *complete chaos* portray the situation without peacekeepers in a strongly negative light. After peacekeeping operations, the news depict a better picture – with safety, peace and no armed conflicts as the following example shows: *UN volunteers on the peacekeeping mission build water source for needy community in Rumbek* (bbc.com 08.12.2020)

The effect of peacekeeping on the onset of local conflict is, however, less clear-cut. The example below shows that peace-keeping comes beyond the boundaries: *Two* ***UN peacekeepers*** *have been killed in* ***Mali*** *in an attack on a convoy in the north of the country* (bbc.com 14.07.2020). The news often highlights the number of peacekeepers killed on the mission, e.g. ***Seven*** *UN peacekeepers killed in eastern DR Congo fighting* (france24.com 15.11.2028); ***Four*** *UN peacekeepers, one Malian soldier killed in Mali attacks* (bbc.com 25.11.2027), and***Three*** *UN peacekeepers,* ***one*** *Malian soldier killed in Mali attack*(euronews.com 24.11.2017).

Crucially, news texts always abound in lexical items condemning the murder or abuse of peacekeepers. The following sentences contain the verb condemn implying strong disapproval of the situation:

*UN* ***condemns*** *deadly attack on peacekeepers in DR Congo* (france24.com 11.12.2017).

*The head of UN force Minusma, Mahamat Saleh Annadif,* ***condemned*** *the attack and said every effort would be made to apprehend those behind it* (bbc.com 14.06.2020).

The reactions and attitudes towards the armed conflicts are often represented in news texts with the help of the so-called **emotion words**, i.e. vocabulary referring to emotions [31, p. 39], such as rage, fury, anger etc. The results of our research demonstrate that only negative emotions are named in describing the situations of armed conflicts. The following example contains the phrase *vent their fury* demonstrating their extreme anger:

e.g. *Protesters vent their fury after troops fail to prevent a rebel attack in Beni in eastern DR Congo* (bbc.com 27.11.2029).

Different emotion words in the synonymic groups are important in news texts describing the reactions to armed conflicts, because they imply various degrees of intensity and emotional involvement. For example, the emotion of anger in describing reactions is designated by the noun *anger* in the most general way. The increasing intensity of anger is represented by the terms *rage, fury, wrath* and *ire*. Resistance to the armed conflicts and inner state of adversity is implied by the words *outrage* and *indignation* – they specify the causes of emotion indicated by the semantic features *‘unfairly treated’, ‘morally wrong’*. The idiom *to be at daggers drawn with smb.* implies counterforce represented by the noun *dagger* standing for 'antagonism'.

*Two policemen were killed the same day by angry demonstrators, the UN Okapi radio said* (bbc.com 27.11.2019).

Stronger emotional reaction is described combining two emotions or feelings. In the following sentence, the emotion word rage is preceded by the noun grief amplifying each other’s’ intensity: *China reacts to the death of two peacekeepers in South Sudan with* ***grief*** *and* ***rage*** (Aljazeera.com 11.06.2016).

Emotion words are also combined with the words of condemnation to achieve a more intensive effect. In the following example the lexical units deeply shocked and deeply saddened referring to emotions combine with the phrases strongly condemn offer our condolences and sincere consolation produce a strong feeling of adversity towards armed conflicts described:

e.g. *“The Chinese army is* ***deeply shocked*** *and strongly condemn the attack,” the Chinese defense ministry said in a statement. “We are* ***deeply saddened*** *by the loss of a life. We offer our condolences and sincere consolations to the families of the dead and injured”* (Aljazeera.com 11.06.2016).

Lexical items representing defending actions at the **international level** are united by the semantic features ‘*peace’* and ‘*between countries’* in their meanings [71]. In the analyzed articles, we have found frequent use of the following:

verbs *to protect, to defend*, *guard against*; *to monitor*

nouns *security, safety, protection, defense; ceasefire*

adjectives *secure, safe*, *protected*.

For example: *Anxious to prevent similar scenes again, the Metropolitan Police have promised that they’ll be on guard against every threat from terrorism downwards* (euronews.com 02.05.2019). In this sentence, the predicate *be on guard against* shows the defending action of the police to protect people.

Finally, defending actions may be implied and inferred from the context, e.g. *My* ***Nazi-fighting*** *mother came as* ***a refugee*** *to America – and showed what is best about it* (washingtonpost.com 25.11.2020). This sentence demonstrates that seeking refuge in America the Nazi-fighting woman was protected.

Defending actions are usually described in the contexts where the armed conflict is depicted. In the next example, the phrase to monitor ceasefire agreement involves international assistance:

***Turkey****’s government has submitted a motion to parliament, seeking its approval to deploy peacekeepers to monitor a ceasefire agreement between* ***Azerbaijan*** *and* ***Armenia****, the state-run news agency reported* (Aljazeera 16.11.2020).

In the next example the phrase beneficial for the peace describes defending actions of the Turkish armed forces in Nagorno-Karabakh armed conflict: *“It has been assessed that for the Turkish Armed Forces personnel … to take part in the Joint Center which Turkey and Russia will form together, will be beneficial for the peace and welfare of the region’s people and is necessary from the point of our national interests,” state-run Anadolu Agency wrote, quoting the motion* (Aljazeera 16.11.2020). The defending actions of Russia in this conflict are represented as overseeing the peace deal: *Russia, which is deploying troops to Nagorno-Karabakh to oversee the peace deal, previously said Turkish troops would not be joining them*.

To conclude, defending actions are depicted in the contexts where destructive actions were mentioned showing attempts to restore the peace.

**2.2.3. Setting**

The setting includes descriptions of places of armed conflicts, the circumstances under which they take place and the consequences that happen.

**2.2.3.1. The place** of armed conflicts can be described by orientational names, i.e. the names of cities, towns, localities etc. [Potapenko]. This is the most typical way to introduce the place, because in news discourse the informative function of every news text is primary [Cotter 2010: 48]. The following example demonstrates how places are reported:

*Two UN peacekeepers have been killed in Mali in an attack on a convoy in the north of the country. The vehicles had stopped while travelling from Tessalit to Gao on Saturday when unidentified gunmen opened fire, a UN statement said* (bbc.com 14.06.2020). Underlined are the place names – *in Mali* locates the conflict in a particular country, *on a convoy in the north of the country* identifies where the attack happened and *from Tessalit to Gao* tracks the trajectory of the movement.

The nouns *refuge* and *shelter* designate the places to be secure.

Sometimes, we also deal with implicit place naming, e.g. *That is where the snipers were* (washingtonpost.com 25.11.2020). In this example, the author does not indicate the place exactly, but the orientation in the described locality is achieved contextually. In the subsequent passage the author several times describes the location – *in Warsaw, here* and *across the city*. The situation occurs in Warsaw which is signaled by the adverbial modifier of place in the first sentence in Warsaw. In the second sentence the author uses anaphoric word here because for one thing the reader has got the idea of the place previously, and for another, the journalists makes a clear statement about his own location now; in such the place name here has also the deictic function, i.e. locating the author: *I am sitting with my mother and son* ***in an outdoor café*** *in Warsaw. It is 2014, and we are here for the commemorations of the 70th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising, when the Polish resistance recaptured much of the city from the Nazis and held it for 63 days. My mother was one of the insurgents.*

Further in this passage, the author uses the phrasal adverbial modifier across the city to show the scope of the conflict: *As a teenage girl, she served as a courier for the underground “Home Army,” carrying weapons, radios and messages across the city* (washingtonpost.com 25.11.2020).

To get from one side to the other, my mother had to “jump” — run across the avenue along a barricade as the snipers opened fire (washingtonpost.com 25.11.2020).

**2.2.3.2. The circumstances** are described by various adverbial phrases and modifiers.

Let’s consider the following example:

*Things go wrong and the innocent get hurt no matter how great the effort to spare civilians and limit collateral damage* (euronews.com 18.01.2018).

The circumstances are also described by the adverbial clauses of time, conditions, concession, attending circumstances or subsequent events. The following examples demonstrate that circumstances are represented by the adverbial clauses:

*As Islamist militant violence escalates France wants the rest of Europe to join the deadly fight* (bbc.com 27.11.2019).

*If you let out the slightest cough from the noxious fumes, the Germans on the street above would open the manholes and throw in grenades* (washingtonpost.com 25.11.2020).

Describing circumstances is not very important in terms of informativeness, but it is crucial for establishing the authors’ viewpoint of the armed conflicts described.

To conclude, we used the expression ‘circumstances associated with the armed conflict’ or ‘, referring to examples such as processes attendant on the conflict itself, its manner or cause; and these notions of ‘when, where, how and why’ armed conflicts happen provide the traditional explanation, by linking circumstances to the four WH-forms of traditional grammar that were adverbs rather than nouns.

**2.2. Conceptual metaphors representing armed conflicts**

An armed conflict is defined as a contested incompatibility that concerns government or territory or both where the use of armed force between two parties results in at least 25 battle-related deaths. Of these two parties, at least one is the government of a state. A state is understood as an internationally recognized sovereign government controlling a specified territory, or a non-recognized government whose sovereignty is not disputed by another internationally recognized sovereign government previously controlling the same territory. This understanding of an armed conflict and state is crucial in explaining metaphors related to war, because in metaphoric expressions the meaning of a state, participants of the armed conflict and the conflict itself is conceptualized in terms of other entities.

The results of our research show that the most common metaphors related to the armed conflicts are WAR IS A GAME and COUNTRY IS HOME. They are discussed below.

**2.2.1. WAR IS A GAME**

Metaphors of game are ubiquitous in news texts about armed conflicts. They are pervasive in explaining various phenomena related to conflicts.

Game metaphors are often used in the news about armed conflicts because they are in keeping with our culture’s prototypical idea that gaming is a normal human action. Taking into account the wide repertoire of games that people can play in their lives, Caillois classified games into two groups:

* games of disequilibrium and destruction;
* games of mimicry (acting and the theater).

Game metaphors are effective in shaping the readers’ views on armed conflicts because they incorporate diverse ideas in many unconnected realms of life. Such metaphors thus simplify various experiences of our life through one explanation, sometimes reflecting a reality that already exists.

Moreover, these metaphors are widespread because they perform multiple functions in one condensed form. Widespread use of such metaphors not only blurs the distinction between war and games but also provides a specific framework for responding to situations in a particular way because a game has a clear structure that can be read and understood.

To begin with, the journalists openly call armed conflicts with the word *game* or *a great game* where the conceptual mapping is obvious: the source domain is gaming and the target domain is armed conflict. Here, one life experience is understood as another experience. These fields of experience are called domains. The source domain – gaming in our case – is concrete and based on perception, and the target domain –an armed conflict – is abstract and is understood on the analogy with the concrete experience.

Let’s consider the following examples: *Putin vs. ISIS: Russia’s great game in Syria* (euronews.com 15.10.2016). In this article, the participants of the armed conflict are Russia and ISIS and their activity is described as great game.

The structure of game metaphor traditionally includes game players, their actions, and game results. In the above example, both gamers are mentioned – Putin and ISIS, however, frequently only one game player is mentioned, e.g. *How Putin wins in Syria* (newsweek.com 06.10.2016). In this example, the journalist names only one participant – Russia and states the action by the verb *to win* which implies achieving victory in a game.

**2.2.2. COUNTRY IS HOME**

Metaphor COUNTRY IS HOME is another typical conceptual structure in news about armed conflicts. The results of our research show that the idea of home is frequently involved in metaphoric expressions to refer to the following:

* the country as a territory where somebody’s home is;
* the nation or a unified national identity.

In both of these meanings, the author often makes an explicit or implicit division between ‘us’ and ‘them’. This canonical opposition we – they is deeply rooted in the mind of every collective identity, having its home, country, sovereignty and traditions.

The idea that “the state is a home to the people” may sound strange, but such effect is achieved by reference to family relationships [44, p. 254]. As the following sentence shows, soldiers deployed on mission are called sons, daughters, wives, husbands, and families:

*While American policymakers discuss troop levels in an anesthetic language of numbers in the tens of thousands, a bone-rattling truth across the globe underlies so many of the lives of soldiers and their* ***sons, daughters, wives, husbands, and families*** (Newsweek.com 06.11.2007).

The source domain is the state, which we usually understand as a political body. The target domain is a home whish we are accustomed to talk about in relation to the geographical region, some space of identification, such as our house, flat or street, or community. In bringing together these domains, the author imposes the idea that the state is a home or a place of personal attachment.

There are some reasons for this conceptual mapping. The liberal understanding of the state typical of the western community invokes a belief that the state is an evil, making people feel skeptical about governments, and an ingrained individualism leading to competition rather than solidarity between citizens [40, p. 41]. When we think of home, we first imagine the house. For the majority of people, it is not only the dwelling place, but also the cozy nooks, the place of relax, happiness, safety and comfort. By bringing the state and the house together, these metaphoric expressions enhance the feelings of safety and comfort in the perception of the state.

The conceptual metaphor COUNTRY IS HOME is the basis for the bulk of various names of establishments and titles in British parliamentary and administrative terminology:

*a cabinet* is a little cupboard and a the inner circle of ministers of the state;

*a house* is a dwelling place and a legislative assembly;

*a chamber* is a room, in particular a bedroom, and also one arm of a legislative body;

*privy* is a private or secret place in the home (such as a toilet), and in the government it is an inner council of advisers or judges.

These references do not mean much in the present use of words, because they have become so conventional that we do not pay attention to them. But they are conceptual in a sense that the idea government is embedded in the monarch’s household [34, p. 15]. Also the names of physical spaces of actual houses have acquired the political meanings.

In addition to physical houses, there are some other reminders of the home–state connection in Britain. For instance, the powerful *Home Office* is a government department with a collection of responsibilities now centered on law and order. Interestingly, the meaning of the name of *the British Home Office* is based on this conceptual metaphor. *The Home Secretary* is also essentially a product of the household of the British monarchy: he or she is the Queen's secretary, a person who was originally concerned with private matters or secrets.

When the Home Office was created in 1782 there were just two secretaries of state, *the Home Secretary*, who was the senior office-holder, and *the Foreign Secretary*[27, p. 46]. Again, we observe here the opposition of we and they, because the meaning of foreign is closely related to alien, distant. The Home Secretary's business was essentially all matters of internal governance, and with time the Home Office successfully embraced a range of responsibilities to do with, such as crime, prisons, mines, rudimentary welfare (poor laws), factories, worker's waging, drunkenness, homelessness, unemployment and other issues. In such a way, it extended the idea of the home to the understanding of the state representing attachment of the people to the state as a place of shelter, protection and identification.

In one of his speeches in February 2012 David Cameron spoke of the Union between Scotland and Britain and said the following: ‘We want people to feel safe, and confident in their homes and neighbourhoods, so they can live freely, contribute to society and prosper in their daily lives’. Today’s news focuses primarily on security, rather than spaces for people to live freely.

**CONCLUSIONS ON PART 2**

Lexical units designating armed conflicts involve three groups of words: 1) nouns and nominal phrases referring to participants of the conflicts, 2) verbs and nouns stating their actions, and 3) phrases describing the setting in which the armed conflicts take place.

The participants of armed conflicts in news articles are named by common and proper nouns and represent three possible roles: the *Aggressor* who threatens people and does harm; the *Victim* who suffers from the Aggressor’s violent actions, and the *Defender* who saves the Victim and ensures global security. The authors’ choice of lexical units and their combination and arrangement in sentences is crucial in identifying these roles in news texts.

The Aggressor is represented in news as the one who posits threat to the others and endangers a particular country, locality or the whole world. In the most general way, Aggressor is named by the nouns *dictator* and *tyrant*, which refer to a person who acts despotically and exercises the ultimate power. The nouns referring to Aggressor are often collocated with evaluative adjectives *violent, rogue, murderous, brutal*, adding still more negative effect in portraying these people. Besides nouns referring to people, Aggressor is often represented metonymically by the names of countries and states, such as *Russia, Pakistan*, organizations and different terrorist groupings, e.g. *ISIS, The Donetsk People’s Republic* etc. The image of a violent Aggressor is enhanced by depicting the object of his aggression – the greater it is, the more powerful the Aggressor seems. Apart from the object *world*, the grand power of the Aggressor may be enacted by naming multiple objects of violence.

The Victim of armed conflict is represented in news as the one who suffers from the Aggressor’s violent actions. The image of Victim is created by appealing to innocence, truthfulness and defenseless which are severely violated by the Aggressor. Lexical means representing the Victim contain the semantic feature of ‘innocence’ and ‘weakness’ in their dictionary definitions. Such words are used nearly in every of the analyzed article and are represented by the verbal and nominal phrases. The most common pattern of representing victims is verbal phrases with the verbs *help, liberate, save, free, defend* + Obj., where the object is the victim. Noun phrases with the adjective *innocent* represent people or whole nations who have become the victims of military conflicts. In sentences 6, for instance, the phrases *innocent people* and *thousands of civilians* collocate with the predicates *launched attach* and *has killed* which resonates on the idea of violent deaths of innocent people.

Defender is represented in news as the one who saves the Victim and ensures global security. The main feature ascribed to Defender in Internet news discourse is *responsibility* for the whole world and stability in it. The most common way to depict the Defender in news is to employ the official names of international organizations, their departments and representatives, e.g. *the UN Security Council, the UN, the UN envoy, western powers*. Such lexical items appeal to strength and authority whom people want to believe and to rely.

The pragmatic effect of the texts that describe the relations between the Defender, the Victim and the Aggressor is explained by the general presupposition of the texts about armed conflicts – that is the value of freedom, security, responsibility and the rule of law is above all, and these values are above the sovereignty of a particular territory or beliefs of some particular state leaders. In such a way, the global readers get the idea that peace should be global, not local, and that makes it possible for some states, the U.S for example, to intervene in the other nations’ affair to ensure global peace.

Armed conflicts are represented in news texts series of destructive and defending actions designated by the verbs and nouns. Destructive actions described more often in the news show in the news how armed conflicts lead to destruction of some property, lives and relations. Defending actions aimed at maintaining security. The understanding of an armed conflict and state is crucial in explaining metaphors related to war, because in metaphoric expressions the meaning of a state, participants of the armed conflict and the conflict itself is conceptualized in terms of other entities. The results of our research show that the most common metaphors related to the armed conflicts are WAR IS A GAME and COUNTRY IS HOME.

**GENERAL CONCLUSIONS**

Numerous armed conflicts in local wars, terrorist attacks, expansive hybrid warfare and international crime are widely discussed by the English-speaking media all over the world. Linguistically, media coverage of armed conflicts is based on a text or discourse type with its own genre and style peculiarities. In news, professional military vocabulary whose function is limited to specialized military discourse appears to be used in media texts aimed at mass, and often commonplace, audience. Military vocabulary includes terminology, i.e. words used in connection with military concepts, and emotionally coloured elements of the military vocabulary, which in most cases are stylistic synonyms of the corresponding military terms. Being used along with general and even colloquial lexical units, and various lexical innovations, the military vocabulary acquires a new function in news texts – shaping public views on particular armed conflicts.

Armed conflicts are represented in the news as taking place not between two armies, but as most devastating on-going conflicts involving many countries. Furthermore, they are often depicted as taking place in countries undergoing major political changes, such as countries that have taken steps towards democratization. In other words, today’s news replaced major demonstration of two superpowers and the acceleration of technological advancements in the army and battle grounds and discuss armed conflicts through the periscope of political communication. Full-scale nuclear war seems in the news less of a threat today, but instead smaller, particularly vicious and more difficult to solve, armed conflicts that to a higher degree implicate civilians as combatants and as victims are represented as posing the biggest threat.

In the news today, democracy is heralded as prime mechanism for societal development and conflict management. Most importantly is the realization that any attempt to promote peace and prevent violent conflict requires active participation, including all societal actors, a multilateral approach and long-term commitments. In this, language means play a crucial role.

Lexical units designating armed conflicts involve three groups of words: 1) nouns and nominal phrases referring to participants of the conflicts, 2) verbs and nouns stating their actions, and 3) phrases describing the setting in which the armed conflicts take place.

The participants of armed conflicts in news articles are named by common and proper nouns and represent three possible roles: the *Aggressor* who threatens people and does harm; the *Victim* who suffers from the Aggressor’s violent actions, and the *Defender* who saves the Victim and ensures global security. The authors’ choice of lexical units and their combination and arrangement in sentences is crucial in identifying these roles in news texts.

The Aggressor is represented in news as the one who posits threat to the others and endangers a particular country, locality or the whole world. In the most general way, Aggressor is named by the nouns *dictator* and *tyrant*, which refer to a person who acts despotically and exercises the ultimate power. The nouns referring to Aggressor are often collocated with evaluative adjectives *violent, rogue, murderous, brutal*, adding still more negative effect in portraying these people. Besides nouns referring to people, Aggressor is often represented metonymically by the names of countries and states, such as *Russia, Pakistan*, organizations and different terrorist groupings, e.g. *ISIS, The Donetsk People’s Republic* etc. The image of a violent Aggressor is enhanced by depicting the object of his aggression – the greater it is, the more powerful the Aggressor seems. Apart from the object *world*, the grand power of the Aggressor may be enacted by naming multiple objects of violence.

The Victim of armed conflict is represented in news as the one who suffers from the Aggressor’s violent actions. The image of Victim is created by appealing to innocence, truthfulness and defenseless which are severely violated by the Aggressor. Lexical means representing the Victim contain the semantic feature of ‘innocence’ and ‘weakness’ in their dictionary definitions. Such words are used nearly in every of the analyzed article and are represented by the verbal and nominal phrases. The most common pattern of representing victims is verbal phrases with the verbs *help, liberate, save, free, defend* + Obj., where the object is the victim. Noun phrases with the adjective *innocent* represent people or whole nations who have become the victims of military conflicts. In sentences 6, for instance, the phrases *innocent people* and *thousands of civilians* collocate with the predicates *launched attach* and *has killed* which resonates on the idea of violent deaths of innocent people.

Defender is represented in news as the one who saves the Victim and ensures global security. The main feature ascribed to Defender in Internet news discourse is *responsibility* for the whole world and stability in it. The most common way to depict the Defender in news is to employ the official names of international organizations, their departments and representatives, e.g. *the UN Security Council, the UN, the UN envoy, western powers*. Such lexical items appeal to strength and authority whom people want to believe and to rely.

The pragmatic effect of the texts that describe the relations between the Defender, the Victim and the Aggressor is explained by the general presupposition of the texts about armed conflicts – that is the value of freedom, security, responsibility and the rule of law is above all, and these values are above the sovereignty of a particular territory or beliefs of some particular state leaders. In such a way, the global readers get the idea that peace should be global, not local, and that makes it possible for some states, the U.S for example, to intervene in the other nations’ affair to ensure global peace.

Armed conflicts are represented in news texts series of destructive and defending actions designated by the verbs and nouns. Destructive actions described more often in the news show in the news how armed conflicts lead to destruction of some property, lives and relations. Defending actions aimed at maintaining security. The understanding of an armed conflict and state is crucial in explaining metaphors related to war, because in metaphoric expressions the meaning of a state, participants of the armed conflict and the conflict itself is conceptualized in terms of other entities.

The results of our research show that the most common metaphors related to the armed conflicts are WAR IS A GAME and COUNTRY IS HOME.Metaphors of game are ubiquitous in news texts about armed conflicts. They are pervasive in explaining various phenomena related to conflicts. Game metaphors are often used in the news about armed conflicts because they are in keeping with our culture’s prototypical idea that gaming is a normal human action. The structure of game metaphor traditionally includes game players, their actions, and game results. In some cases, both gamers are mentioned; however, frequently only one game player is represented and the other implied.

Metaphor COUNTRY IS HOME is another typical conceptual structure in news about armed conflicts. The results of our research show that the idea of home is frequently involved in metaphoric expressions to refer to the following: the country as a territory where somebody’s home is; and the nation or a unified national identity. In both of these meanings, the author often makes an explicit or implicit division between ‘us’ and ‘them’.
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**РЕЗЮМЕ**

магістерської роботи **Грабар Ангеліни Олександрівни** на тему

«**Лексико-стилістичні особливості позначення збройних конфліктів у англомовних Інтернет-текстах новин»**

Робота складається зі вступу, двох розділів та загальних висновків. Обсяг роботи складає 62 сторінки. Список використаної літератури нараховує 72 позиції.

Перший розділ роботи пропонує визначення військової лексики, її структурних особливостей і підходів до класифікації – семантичного й функціонального. Розділ також включає визначення сучасного дискурсу новин і пояснення ролі військової лексики в новинах.

Другий розділ включає результати аналізу мовних засобів на позначення збройних конфліктів в англомовних Інтернет-новинах. Дослідження демонструє, що збройні конфлікти в новинах описуються як такі, що відбуваються не між двома арміями, а між країнами, їх урядами та цілими спільнотами. Встановлено, що названі учасники представлені в текстах новин як Агресори, Захисники та Жертви. Самі конфлікти представлені як низка руйнівних та захисних дій, позначених відповідними дієсловами, іменниками та прикметниками. Встановлено, що деструктивні дії називаються в новинахчастіше, і зображають руйнування людського майна, життя та стосунків. Захисні дії, спрямовані на підтримання безпеки, йменуються лексичними одиницями, що представляють оборону на міжнародному рівні. Найпоширеніші метафори, розкриті в цьому дослідженні, є ВІЙНА Є ГРА та КРАЇНА Є ДОМІВКА.

**Ключові слова**: збройний конфлікт, тексти новин, концептуальна метафора, лексична одиниця, експліцитне та імпліцитне значення, сема.

**ABSTRACT**

on Master’s paper prepared by **Angelina Hrabar**

**Lexical and stylistic peculiarities of designating armed conflicts in English internet news texts**

The paper studies the linguistic means of representing armed conflicts in English Internet news. It consists of two parts and conclusions. The volume is 62 pages and the list of references includes 72 items.

The first chapter suggests the definition of military vocabulary in English, its structural peculiarities and approaches to classification – semantic and functional. Moreover, it reveals the features of English Internet news featuring armed conflicts.

The second chapter is dedicated to the analysis of the linguistic means of representing armed conflicts in English Internet news. The research shows that armed conflicts are depicted in the news as taking place not between two armies, but between countries, their governments and the whole communities. Their participants are represented as the Aggressors, the Defenders and the Victims. The conflicts are depicted as a series of destructive and defending actions designated by the corresponding verbs, nouns and adjectives. The study reveals that destructive actions, depicted more often in the news, show how armed conflicts lead to ruining of some property, lives and relations. Defending actions aimed at maintaining security are named by lexical items which represent defense at the international level. The most common metaphors revealed in this study are WAR IS A GAME and COUNTRY IS HOME.

**Key words**: armed conflict, news texts, conceptual metaphor, lexical unit, explicit and implicit meaning, semantic feature.