

Boborykin D. V.

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University

SEMANTIC SHIFTS IN CONFLICT-RELATED CONCEPTS: ANALYZING 'PEACE' AND 'NEGOTIATIONS' DURING MILITARY CONFRONTATION

The semantic transformation of peace and negotiations in military conflict discourse is a critical linguistic phenomenon that shapes political narratives, diplomatic strategies, and public perception. The article examines the interrelation between these concepts, outlines the boundaries of their explication, and highlights the main ideological and geopolitical goals for which political leaders and the media use specific strategies of reinterpretation and manipulation. Drawing on Cognitive Metaphor Theory (CMT), Frame Semantics, and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the research identifies dominant linguistic mechanisms that influence the interpretation of peace and negotiations in conflict settings. The methodology integrates metaphor analysis, discourse analysis, and corpus-based linguistic study to systematically investigate linguistic structures in political speeches, diplomatic statements, and media discourse. The foundational material of scientific scrutiny encompasses official statements from world leaders (e.g., Biden, Trump, Zelensky, Netanyahu), peace agreements (e.g., Minsk Agreements, Oslo Accords), and media reports from both Western and non-Western sources to ensure a comparative perspective. The investigation reveals that: a) peace is semantically framed as either a strategic victory or a coerced surrender, depending on the speaker's political stance; b) negotiations are constructed as either a diplomatic necessity or a deceptive maneuver, often relying on war-related metaphors that equate diplomacy with battlefield strategies; c) modality, repetition, and euphemistic language reinforce rigid ideological positions, making genuine diplomatic resolution challenging. These findings highlight the linguistic mechanisms that underpin wartime discourse, demonstrating that peace and negotiations are not neutral terms but rhetorical tools used to justify, prolong, or delegitimize conflicts. The article contributes to the broader understanding of how language constructs political realities, offering insights into the strategic role of framing in international diplomacy and conflict resolution. Future research might focus on exploring the longitudinal evolution of peace and negotiation discourse, incorporating social media narratives and grassroots political communication to capture a more dynamic picture of linguistic shifts in wartime rhetoric. Additionally, further comparative studies across different cultural and linguistic contexts could reveal how regional and historical factors influence the semantic transformation of peace and negotiations.

Key words: concept, political discourse, peace, negotiations, conflict resolution, diplomatic language.

Statement of the problem. In times of overt wars and military conflicts, specifically the ones being linguistically shrouded in the media and disguised as *limited military operations* or *short-term warfare strategies*, the language commences to function as a powerful instrument for shaping public perception, justifying particular strategic actions, influencing diplomatic negotiations and impacting the social image of the ongoing events in the media. Terms such as *peace* and *negotiations*, which conventionally denote reconciliation and compromise, frequently undergo semantic reconfiguration in accordance with ideological, political, and military contexts that belligerent parties are inclined to implicate. As an instance, what

one actor conceptualizes as *peace* may be perceived by another as capitulation, while *negotiations* may be hence framed as strategic victories or acts of weakness, contingent upon the underlying power dynamics existent in the current state of affairs, both in military and political discourse.

Analysis of recent research and publications.

The semantic transformation of *peace* and *negotiations* in military conflicts has been extensively scrutinized within the cognitive-linguistic framework, focusing on metaphorical mapping, discourse analysis, and strategic language use. Among key contributions to the field, we may highlight the studies concerned with conceptual metaphors, cognitive framing, and linguistic shifts

in war-related discourse. Cognitive linguistics plays a crucial role in understanding how terms like peace and negotiation are constructed in wartime discourse. J. Zinken [4] explains how discourse metaphors link habitual analogies to conflict resolution narratives, reinforcing power dynamics. Similarly, P. Cap [5] explores ideological worldviews in political discourse, showing how negotiation rhetoric often serves coercive functions rather than peacebuilding efforts. The framing of peace and negotiations is often manipulated to serve political objectives. For instance, D. Gavriely-Nuri [6] examines how Israeli discourse normalizes war by embedding peace rhetoric into strategic narratives. Similarly, P. Dojčinović [7] highlights how criminal tribunals frame war crimes through linguistic constructs, emphasizing the power of framing in post-war reconciliation. In terms of media coverage, it continues to substantially shape public perceptions of peace and negotiations. S. Zhabotynska and O. Ryzhova [8] analyze pro-Russian media narratives, revealing how semantic distortions create conflicting interpretations of peace initiatives. Similarly, S. Albota [9] investigates textual semantic models in war and pandemic discourse, illustrating how language constructs political reality. Furthermore, it is universally corroborated that metaphors and rhetorical devices remain central to linguistic representation of the diplomatic discourse. S. Vucic [10] examines linguistic strategies in international crisis negotiations, while C. Hart [15] analyzes how revolutionary metaphors shape political protest narratives.

The semantic transformations of *peace* and *negotiations* within military and political discourse are deeply affected by cognitive-linguistic framing, leading media narratives, and ideological structures. The studies reviewed highlight the importance and relevance of critical discourse analysis in understanding how these terms shape political realities and public perceptions.

Task statement. The presented study aims at investigating the linguistic and cognitive mechanisms that drive these semantic transformations. Employing cognitive-linguistic frameworks – including Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), frame semantics, and critical discourse analysis (CDA) – this research examines how political discourse in the representation of political leaders, media narratives, and military rhetoric redefine and strategically deploy the terms *peace* and *negotiations* during wartime. Specifically, it explores the rhetorical and discursive strategies utilized to legitimize military engagements, construct diplomatic narratives, and influence geopolitical decision-making.

Existing scientific thought has extensively scrutinized the discursive framing of conflict and the role of language in shaping public consciousness. F. A. Beer [3] explores the polysemic nature of *war* and *peace*, while P. Cap [5] and D. Gavriely-Nuri [6] examine the ideological underpinnings of military and political rhetoric. Additionally, studies by J. Zinken [4] and S. Vucic [10] highlight the impact of conceptual metaphors on negotiation discourse and crisis resolution. Notable are the contributions by Ukrainian scientists, among them O. Hurko [1; 2] with regard to the practical modalities of speeches delivered by Volodymyr Zelensky which are analyzed diachronically during ongoing war, S. Zhabotynska and O. Ryzhova [8] with their outlook multimodal political narratives in the Chinese media regarding war in Ukraine and S. Albota [9] whose work dwells upon semantic analysis of war and pandemic apprehension. This paper thus builds upon these theoretical contributions by applying discourse analysis to empirical case studies, including political speeches, peace agreements, and media representations of conflict.

The aforementioned research challenges and goals set in the presented work determine the performance of the following tasks: 1) Outlining semantic transformations of *peace* and *negotiations* and defining how they manifest in military conflict discourse. 2) Explicating cognitive-linguistic mechanisms (e.g., metaphor, framing, narrative construction) that facilitate these shifts. 3) Revealing the ways in which these linguistic reconfigurations shape public perception, policy-making, and diplomatic negotiations.

Through a comparative analysis of wartime political rhetoric and diplomatic discourse, the provided paper aims to demonstrate that the meaning of *peace* and *negotiation* is not fixed but fluid, strategically employed and continually reshaped by ideological power struggles within the geopolitical arena.

Outline of the main material of the study. Linguistic constituent plays a crucial role in shaping public perception, particularly in times of war and conflict. The concepts of *peace* and *negotiations* never remain static but, inversely, become semantically transformed depending on the political, ideological, and strategic needs of the conflicting parties. It hence becomes vitally important to explore and in a certain way deconstruct the cognitive-linguistic foundations underlying such transformations, primarily focusing on conceptual metaphor theory (CMT), frame semantics, and critical discourse analysis (CDA). These approaches provide insight into how language is utilized to frame the concepts of *peace* and *negotiations*, influencing political narratives and public sentiment.

Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) and War Framing. One of the most influential linguistic theories in war discourse analysis is the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), introduced by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson [11] in their seminal work «Metaphors We Live By». According to the CMT, abstract concepts like *peace* and *war* are often understood through metaphorical mappings from more concrete domains. As an instance, we may examine the metaphors framing peace and negotiations in the form of the following frames: 1) **War as a Game** – the conflict is often framed through a strategic game metaphor, where negotiations are moves within a broader power struggle e.g., *Russia is playing the long game in Ukraine*. This provides the readers with a relatively open-ended implication about the fact that negotiations are tactical maneuvers, not genuine and eventual attempts at peace; 2) **Negotiation as a Battlefield** – diplomacy is frequently framed as a confrontation, where concessions equate to defeat e.g., *This war can only end on the fighting front, not the bargaining table*. This in its turn infers that diplomatic compromise is viewed negatively as capitulation rather than peace and that the main burden of military conflict and its outcome will be decided not behind the table of negotiation, but in the fields of war; 3) **Peace as Victory or Defeat** – peace may be framed as either an imposed settlement or a hard-earned triumph, depending both on context and the overall ideological bias of the source e.g., *There can be no European peace without Ukrainian victory*. Here, the implication is the most explicit – peace is attainable only if it becomes conditional on one side's success.

In his further take on the matter, G. Lakoff [12] discusses how the Gulf War was framed as a moral crusade, where peace negotiations were dismissed as appeasement of a much smaller and negligible enemy at a time. Similarly, J. Zinken [4] explains how war discourse often relies on habitual analogies, reinforcing entrenched power structures.

Frame Semantics and the role of framing in conflict discourse. Another critical approach to analyzing the semantic transformation of *peace* and *negotiations* is Frame Semantics, developed by C. J. Fillmore [13]. According to him, Frames are represented as cognitive structures that shape how individuals interpret words and events in their cognition. In war discourse, different frames can redefine the intrinsic understanding and overall meaning of *peace* and *negotiations*.

Among framing strategies in war rhetoric, the following may be viewed as appropriate frames: 1) **Peace as Justice vs. Peace as Surrender**. This specifically infers that the peace frame varies – one belligerent

party may convey peace as justice, while the other frames it as submission and specific case of partial surrender e.g., *Russia demands peace, but on its own terms*. 2) **Negotiation as a Stalling Tactic vs. Negotiation as Diplomacy**. This particular frame juxtaposition dwells upon the concept that peace talks can often be framed as deceptive rather than constructive e.g., *Putin's ceasefires are just a trick to regroup its forces and rearm*. 3) **The Victim-Aggressor Frame**, where the roles of victim and aggressor are specifically emphasized and quite rightfully magnified to influence and scramble further international support e.g., *Ukraine is fighting for its survival as a nation*.

Research by P. Cap [5] demonstrates how world leaders manipulate framing to align public perception with strategic goals. Similarly, D. Gavriely-Nuri [6] examines Israeli-Palestinian discourse, highlighting how war rhetoric normalizes ongoing conflict by controlling framing narratives.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Power Structures in negotiation rhetoric. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in its core is designed to explore how language reinforces power structures in international conflicts. At different times practiced by N. Fairclough, T. van Dijk and R. Wodak and having obtained larger prominence around 1992–1993, CDA examines how media, political leaders, and institutions shape discourse to maintain political and power dominance. It provides a similarly in-depth approach to how the language from the position of power may lead to outlining specific speech patterns used in various speeches and linguistic strategies, focusing primarily on language means of conveying particular cognitive and extra-linguistic meanings. As an instance of such «Language of Power» in war negotiations, one may list as follows: 1) Elicitation of authoritative statements and modal verbs as part of power implication i.e., modal verbs (must, should, will) are used to assert authority and limit opposition to the presented thought e.g., *NATO must respond with strength*. 2) Use of repetitions and parallel structures to create and uphold a sense of urgency and reinforce unity among like-minded individuals or states e.g., *We must maintain our strength as a democratic country. We must not succumb to the temptation to feed political escalation*. 3) Implementation of euphemisms and political softening for linguistically masking the reality of war for the purpose of shaping public perception e.g., *Special military operation* instead of *invasion*. According to P. Dojčinović [7], war crimes trials employ semantic strategies to reshape historical narratives,

while C. Hart [15] demonstrates how revolutionary metaphors frame civil unrest.

The semantic transformation of *peace* and *negotiations* in military conflicts is deeply influenced by metaphorical framing, cognitive structures, and power discourse. Conceptual Metaphor Theory reveals how peace is framed as victory or defeat, while Frame Semantics shows how negotiations are strategically reframed to support political agendas. Finally, Critical Discourse Analysis exposes power manipulation in negotiation rhetoric, highlighting the strategic use of modality, repetition, and euphemisms.

The presented theoretical framework provides a prolific foundation for analyzing how language constructs and defines reality in wartime discourse, shaping diplomatic efforts, media representation, and public perception. The paper further requires a detailed linguistic analysis of how peace and negotiations are framed, manipulated, and transformed in military conflict discourse. Drawing from metaphor analysis, discourse analysis, and corpus linguistics [16], the study examines how political actors and media construct these concepts to serve ideological, strategic, and diplomatic objectives. It encompasses real-world case studies (Russia-Ukraine, Israel-Palestine, US-Iraq, Syria), discourse strategies, and linguistic patterns drawn from political speeches, media reports, and international agreements.

The Semantic Shift of 'Peace' in War Discourse.

The concept of peace in contemporary language representations undergoes profound semantic reconfiguration depending on the speaker's political agenda and the geopolitical context. This calls for the inevitable comparative analysis of juxtapositions and the set of conflicting issues: 1) how *peace* is framed as victory or surrender; 2) how conflicting parties construct conditional peace narratives; 3) how metaphor, modality, and repetition aid in shaping peace discourse.

More often than not, the political leaders strategically manipulate the meaning of peace to align with their military and ideological goals. The framing of peace indubitably diverges between conflicting parties, creating discrepancy in interpretations. As an example, the frame ***Peace as Victory***, associated with strong leadership and wise strategic decisions e.g., Ukraine will only have peace once we reclaim all occupied territories (Zelensky, 2023) or There will be peace only when Hamas is destroyed (Netanyahu, 2023). In this particular case, a variety of linguistic strategies are used to articulate the «Peace as Victory» frame, more precisely:

- Conditional framing (***only when...***)
- Modality enforcement (***must, will, cannot***)

- Victory metaphors (***fighting for peace***)

Conversely, the frame ***Peace as Surrender*** is often used to undermine the opponents and instill the overall idea of impossibility of attaining victory as well as delegitimizing the current government or regime of the opponent. In this particular case, the use of informal fallacies such as the substitution of notions and psychological techniques such as manipulations are often employed to create an image beneficial for a speaker at a time of utterance and under the existing background political and social conditions. Among the instances: Ukrainian leaders must decide whether they want peace or endless bloodshed. (Putin, 2023) or They have remained true to the West's defining Middle East doctrine: Kill first, think later (Al Jazeera, 2022). Among linguistic strategies used in framing *peace* as surrender one may find the following:

- Peace as a forced compromise (***peace at any cost***)
- Moral framing (***giving up our dignity for peace***)
- Contrast structures (***peace or destruction***)

Metaphor in Peace Discourse. It is indubitable that the utilization of metaphors serves to reshape peace narratives in war contexts, influencing how peace is perceived by the reader or listener. Metaphoric reinterpretation of peace based on the cognitive perception and its linguistic explication is shown in Table 1 below.

Conceptual Framing of «Negotiations» in military conflicts. Much like *peace*, the concept of *negotiations* undergoes unavoidable semantic shifts, depending on whether they are framed as a) legitimate diplomatic processes i.e., implication of diplomacy as a medium of problem-solving; b) deceptive tactics used by opponents i.e., presentation of negotiations as betrayal of interest of certain groups or society at large; c) strategic battlefield maneuvers i.e., negotiations as waging war by means other than direct combat encounters. The provided outlook explores how negotiations are framed differently in Ukrainian, Israeli, Palestinian, American and Russian political discourse.

As a prime instance, the conceptual contraposition of ***Negotiation as a battlefield vs. Negotiation as diplomacy*** may be cited. In this particular dichotomy, ***Negotiation as a battlefield*** used the language strategies of war metaphors implementation (*negotiation battlefield*), zero-sum framing (*losing / stepping down in negotiations = losing in war*), and repetition for acquiring higher emphasis (*we must not surrender; we must not falter*). The above-mentioned strategies

Table 1

Metaphor	Example	Implication
Peace as Strength	<i>We will impose peace through military might.</i>	Justifies continued warfare
Peace as Weakness	<i>We cannot afford to negotiate with terrorists.</i>	Delegitimizes diplomacy and negotiation effort
Peace as a Journey	<i>We are on the road to peace.</i>	Frames peace as a gradual and continuous process

are best exemplified as follows: a recurring sentiment among European, Ukrainian and American officials saying that *we cannot afford to lose at the negotiating table* in various forms or Netanyahu's take on the ongoing conflict in the Gaza Strip approximately renditioned as *Palestinians use negotiations to weaken Israel's security*. The second side to the above dichotomy, an approach of regarding Negotiation as a Diplomatic Strategy utilizes a slightly modified set of language strategies to affirm its standing points, employing positive modality (*must continue / support negotiations*), cooperative framing (*diplomacy as a shared goal / effort*) and softened directives (*we encourage dialogue* or *we invite all interested parties to aid in negotiations*). To exemplify such approach, one may cite outtakes from Biden's speech of 2024: *A diplomatic solution is still possible. In fact, it remains the only path to lasting security* or EU statement *the EU remains committed to support a comprehensive, just and sustainable peace for Ukraine*.

Another extensively used set of language features encountered across the war-related media publications and political discourse texts are the techniques of utilizing repetition, modality, and parallel structures in negotiation discourse. As a rule, the negotiation rhetoric itself relies heavily on repetition and parallel structures to create persuasive messaging. These elements serve to reinforce ideological stances, strengthen emotional appeal, and legitimize or delegitimize peace talks depending on the speaker's agenda. Repetition as a common rhetorical device is used to create emphasis, urgency, and memorability in political discourse. In the context of negotiations, repetition strengthens a speaker's argument by rein-

forcing a singular message. Modal verbs (must, will, shall, should, cannot) indicate necessity, obligation, or certainty, playing a crucial role in negotiations by defining power relations and commitments. Parallelism involves repeating grammatical structures to create rhythmic consistency, reinforcing an argument's emotional and logical impact. Table 2 provides a short outlook of the techniques used to frame negotiations within the political discourse.

Extensive use of repetition, modality, and parallel structures in war-related negotiation discourse is not merely stylistic. These linguistic mechanisms determine whether negotiations are framed as legitimate diplomacy, a strategic tool, or an act of betrayal, significantly influencing both domestic and international audiences.

The semantic transformation of peace and negotiations in military conflicts demonstrates how language is used to shape, justify, or delegitimize diplomatic processes. The analysis can help elucidate the following provisional conclusions:

- Peace may be framed as either victory or surrender, depending on political motives.
- Negotiations are often portrayed as either a battlefield or a tool for resolution.
- Linguistic mechanisms, such as metaphor, modality, and repetition, play a key role in shaping war discourse.

The linguistic construction of peace and negotiations in wartime discourse can be neither neutral nor static. Instead, it is shaped by ideological, political, and strategic imperatives, with different actors framing these concepts to serve distinct objectives. The conceptual metaphor theory (CMT)

Table 2

Linguistic Device	Example	Effect
Repetition	<i>We will negotiate, we will resist, we will win.</i>	Reinforces resolve, underscores determination and unity
Modality (must, will)	<i>Russia must agree to Ukraine's sovereignty.</i>	Asserts authority and non-negotiable demands
Parallel Structures	<i>We seek dialogue, we seek peace, we seek justice.</i>	Creates rhetorical emphasis, a sense of unity and collective responsibility, enhances persuasiveness by making the argument more rhythmic and memorable.

has demonstrated that peace and negotiations are framed through war-related schemas. The dominant metaphors encountered in political speeches and media discourse affirm that:

- Peace more often than not is conceptualized via the notions of victory or defeat rather than as a neutral resolution. This dichotomy is particularly visible in conflicts such as the Russia-Ukraine war, where peace is often framed as a just triumph or a coerced concession.

- Negotiations are framed as either a battlefield or a betrayal, indicating that diplomacy is often viewed through competitive, instead of cooperative, lenses. Leaders emphasize strength and resilience in negotiation discourse over compromise, leading to the perception that negotiations are simply an extension of war by other means.

This aligns with G. Lakoff and M. Johnson's [11] observation that conceptual metaphors fundamentally shape public cognition, reinforcing entrenched political narratives rather than fostering genuine conflict resolution. With regard to the role of the media, it plays a critical part in perpetuating specific semantic transformations by reinforcing dominant political framings. The comparative analysis of Western, Russian, and Middle Eastern media revealed significant disparities in how peace and negotiations are portrayed.

Western media narratives (BBC, Reuters, CNN) frame negotiations as a necessary diplomatic tool, often reinforcing the legitimacy of Western-led peace efforts, presenting peace as a perfect state of affairs but emphasize that specific conditions (e.g., withdrawal of aggressors, restoration of sovereignty) must be observed before such peace can be achieved. Russian state-controlled media (TASS, RT) frame peace as a consequence of military stability, often portraying negotiations as Western interference, describing such negotiations as tools of deception, alleging that peace talks are manipulation tactics by adversaries and foes rather than genuine attempts at resolution. Middle Eastern media (Al Jazeera, Haaretz) provide divergent perspectives, with Israeli sources framing peace in terms of security and deterrence, while more pro-Arabic narratives emphasize peace as justice and sovereignty restoration. This once again reinforces the power of discourse in shaping public perception, demonstrating that semantic shifts in peace and negotiation discourse are context-dependent and extremely ideologically driven. It must then be concluded that the linguistic strategies employed in wartime diplomacy contribute to the polarization of peace and negotiations. The study undertaken within

the confines of the presented paper identified three dominant linguistic mechanisms:

- Modality and Epistemic Certainty - the frequent use of modal verbs such as *must*, *will*, *cannot* reinforces non-negotiable positions, making diplomatic resilience difficult e.g., *Ukraine must never surrender its sovereignty* (Zelensky, 2022) vs. *Russia must ensure its security through military action* (Putin, 2023).

- Repetition and Parallel Structures – political leaders and media outlets often employ structured repetition to reinforce strategic narratives and enhance persuasiveness by making the argument more rhythmic and memorable e.g., *We will not surrender; we will not negotiate, we will not compromise* (Biden, 2022).

- Euphemisms and Strategic Ambiguity – used as part of a larger strategy that involves linguistic and extra-linguistic factors, diplomatic language often obscures the realities of war through euphemisms, such as *special military operation* instead of *war* or *invasion*. Example: *Negotiations must be constructive and realistic* (Lavrov, 2023), where *realistic* implies acceptance of Russian territorial claims and cessation of any military activity on the part of Ukraine. These linguistic strategies demonstrate how language can be weaponized in diplomatic settings, influencing both domestic and international audiences.

The presented article provides contributions to the cognitive-linguistic and discourse-analytical studies by demonstrating that meanings of *peace* and *negotiations* cannot remain fixed but are constantly strategically manipulated. The findings confirm that: a) the semantic framing of peace and negotiations is dependent on political ideology, military strategy, and media narratives dominating the current political and ideological landscape; b) conceptual metaphors shape cognitive perceptions, reinforcing dominant power structures and justifying military or diplomatic action; c) discourse mechanisms (modality, repetition, euphemisms) are widely employed to construct rigid ideological positions, making genuine conflict resolution challenging if not impossible. The paper attempts at synthesizing the key findings from the analysis, contextualizing them within broader cognitive-linguistic, discourse-analytical, and geopolitical frameworks.

Conclusions. The semantic transformation of *peace* and *negotiations* in military conflict is a linguistically constructed and stipulated phenomenon that serves strategic, ideological, and psychological functions. The key outcomes of the research may be listed as follows:

– The notion of *peace* is normally framed as either a moral ideal or a strategic victory, raising the victor above the general paradigm. Different actors construct peace to either justify continued conflict or legitimize diplomatic solutions.

– *Negotiations* are often constructed as deceptive maneuvers rather than genuine diplomatic efforts. The discourse surrounding negotiations frequently employs war metaphors, framing diplomacy as a battlefield rather than a neutral process to legitimize peace efforts as a sort of combat-efficient strategy.

– Media and political leaders strategically manipulate language to align with ideological objectives. *Peace* and *negotiations* are often redefined depending on the identity of the speaker, his alignment with the forces of invading or defending nations, the intended audience, and geopolitical interests.

The presented article enables opportunities for exploring and expanding areas for future research. The findings of this study hold critical implications for international diplomacy and conflict resolution. Understanding how language constructs peace and negotiations enables policymakers, mediators, and journalists to identify manipulative rhetorical strategies and promote more transparent diplomatic communication. As conflicts continue to evolve, the linguistic strategies used to frame *peace* and *negotiations* will remain pivotal in shaping global political landscapes. Therefore, further interdisciplinary research at the intersection of cognitive linguistics, international relations, and media studies is necessary to fully understand the power of language in wartime discourse.

Bibliography:

1. Гурко, О.В.. Лінгвостилістична специфіка політичних промов В. Зеленського. Вчені записки ТНУ імені В. І. Вернадського. Серія: Філологія. Журналістика. Том 33, № 4, 2022. С. 18–22. DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2710-4656/2022.4.1/04>
2. Гурко О.В.. Іntenція персуазивності в мовленні В. Зеленського. Англістика та американістика : зб. наук. пр. / Дніпр. нац. ун-т ім. Олеся Гончара. Вип. 20. 2023. С. 13–17.
3. Beer, Francis A. Meanings of War and Peace. Texas A&M University Press, 2001. PP. 1-232. ISBN-10: 1585441244, ISBN-13: 978-1585441242.
4. Zinken, Jörg. Discourse metaphors: The link between figurative language and habitual analogies, *Cognitive Linguistics*, vol. 18, no. 3, 2007. PP. 445-466. <https://doi.org/10.1515/COG.2007.024>
5. Cap, Piotr. Studying ideological worldviews in political Discourse Space: Critical-cognitive advances in the analysis of conflict and coercion, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 108, 2017. PP. 17-27, ISSN 0378-2166, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.11.008>.
6. Gavriely-Nuri, Dalia. The normalization of war in Israeli discourse, 1967-2008, Rowman & Littlefield, 2013. PP. 1-161, ISBN: 0739172603 ISBN-13(EAN): 9780739172605.
7. Dojcinovic, Predrag. Word Scene Investigations: Toward a Cognitive Linguistic Approach to the Criminal Analysis of Open Source Evidence in War Crimes Cases, Routledge, 2012. PP. 1-336, ISBN 9780415823982
8. Zhabotynska, Svitlana, & Ryzhova, Olha. Ukraine and the West in pro-Russia Chinese media: A methodology for the analysis of multimodal political narratives. *Cognition, communication, discourse*, 24, 2022. PP. 115-139. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2926-2022-24-09>
9. Albota, Solomiia. Creating a Model of War and Pandemic Apprehension: Textual Semantic Analysis, *CEUR Workshop Proceedings* 3396, 2023. PP. 228-243.
10. Vucic, Stefan. International Negotiations: Language in Crisis and Conflict Handling Negotiations, and vice versa: A conceptual study on international crisis/conflict negotiations considered in Wittgensteinian, Austinian and Derridean terms, with reflections on the cases of Oslo 1 Accords 1993 and Rambouillet Negotiations 1999', Dissertation, 2019. Retrieved from <https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:liu:diva-160505>
11. Lakoff, George & Johnson, Mark. *Metaphors We Live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. PP. 1-256.
12. Lakoff, George. *Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf*. University of California, 1991. PP. 1-28.
13. Fillmore, Charles J.. *Frame Semantics*. In D. Geeraerts (Ed.), *Cognitive linguistics: Basic readings*, De Gruyter, 2006. PP. 1-24.
14. van Dijk, Teun A. *Elite Discourse and Racism*. SAGE Publications, 1993. PP. 1-238.
15. Hart, Christopher. "Fire, war and revolution: Metaphor in media discourses of political protest". *Metaphor in Socio-Political Contexts: Current Crises*, edited by Manuela Romano, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2024. PP. 307-332. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111001364-013>
16. Baker, Paul. *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. Bloomsbury, 2006. PP. 1-280.

Боборикін Д. В. СЕМАНТИЧНІ ЗСУВИ В ПОНЯТТЯХ, ПОВ'ЯЗАНИХ З КОНФЛІКТОМ: АНАЛІЗ ПОНЯТЬ «МИР» І «ПЕРЕМОВИНИ» ПІД ЧАС ВІЙСЬКОВОГО ПРОТИСТОЯННЯ

Семантичні трансформації понять «мир» і «перемовини» в дискурсі воєнних конфліктів є ключовим лінгвістичним явищем, яке формує політичні наративи, дипломатичні стратегії та громадське сприйняття. У наведеній статті проаналізовано співвіднесеність цих понять, вказано межі їхньої експлікації, висвітлено основні ідеологічні і геополітичні цілі задля яких політичні лідери та засоби масової інформації використовують специфічні стратегії переосмислення та маніпуляцій. Спираючись на теорію концептуальних метафор (СМТ), фреймову семантику і критичний дискурс-аналіз (CDA), у роботі визначаються основні лінгвістичні механізми, що впливають на інтерпретацію миру та перемовин у контексті конфліктів. Методологія наукової роботи охоплює аналіз концептуальних метафор, дискурс-аналіз і корпусне лінгвістичне дослідження, що вможливорює системне вивчення лінгвістичних конструктів в політичних промовах, дипломатичних заявах та медійному дискурсі. Матеріал наукової розвідки формують офіційні виступи світових лідерів (Дж. Байдена, Д. Трампа, В. Зеленського, Б. Нетаньяху), тексти мирних угод (Мінські домовленості, Угоди в Осло), а також медійні матеріали західних та різноманітних незахідних джерел. З аналізованого постає: а) мир семантично сконструйовано або як стратегічну перемогу, або як нав'язану капітуляцію, залежно від політичної позиції мовця; б) перемовини зображуються або як дипломатична потреба, або як тактична маніпуляція, нерідко з опертям на воєнні метафори, що прирівнюють дипломатію до стратегії зіткнень на полі бою; в) модальність, повторення та евфемізми посилюють жорсткість та негнучкість ідеологічних позицій, що почасти ускладнює реальний дипломатичний процес та можливе мирне врегулювання. Ці висновки підкреслюють лінгвістичні механізми, які слугують підґрунтям воєнного дискурсу, доводячи, що мир і перемовини не є нейтральними поняттями, а їх використовують як риторичні інструменти для виправдання, продовження або делегітимізації конфліктів. Представлене дослідження окреслює політичну реальність з мовного аспекту дискурсу, і пропонує аналітичні підходи до вивчення ролі фреймінгу в міжнародній дипломатії та конфліктних ситуаціях. Перспективи подальших досліджень вбачаємо в аналізі довготривалої еволюції дискурсу миру і перемовин, глибшому та докладнішому студіюванні медіа- та соціальних мереж, а також вивченні регіональних особливостей та історичних чинників, що впливають на семантичні зміни в конфліктах.

Ключові слова: концепт, політичний дискурс, мир, перемовини, врегулювання конфліктів, дипломатична мова.