

Nazi Iritspukhova

COVID-19: WAR OF METAPHORS
THE COVERAGE OF NOVEL CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC IN GEORGIAN NEWS
REPORTS

Abstract

The paper uses the concepts of metaphor scenarios (Musolff, 2006; 2016) and discourse metaphors (Zinken et al, 2008) to analyze media discourses, specifically those of news reports, about COVID-19 (Novel coronavirus) situation in Georgia. The time span runs from the first confirmed case of COVID-19 in Georgia, i.e. February 26th, till mid-May. The methodology also relies on earlier studies of infections and other diseases such as SARS, avian/bird flu, ZIKA, Foot and Mouth Disease, AID/HIV, cancer, etc. For identifying metaphorical linguistic expressions, the combination of Metaphor Identification Procedure /MIP (Pragglejaz Group, 2007) and its extended version, MIPVU (Steen et al., 2010) was employed.

The revealed metaphors demonstrate that the pandemic in Georgia is mostly framed in terms of the WARFARE, JOURNEY and DISASTER super-scenarios, in Nerlich's terms (Nerlich, 2011). In addition, the data show that the novel coronavirus may itself serve as a good source domain (Lakoff & Johnson, 198/2003; Grady, 1997, Kövecses, 2002; 2010) for political and societal issues: failures of the globalization, fear of foreigners and the future parliamentary election system in Georgia.

Key Words: COVID-19, novel coronavirus, metaphors, metaphor scenarios, disease, discourse metaphors, news reports

1. Introduction

Metaphors may create realities for us...

A metaphor may thus be a guide for future actions.

Such actions will, of course, fit the metaphor.

This will, in turn, reinforce the power of the metaphor to make experience coherent.

In this sense metaphors can be self-prophecies.

Lakoff & Johnson, 1980/2003: 156

Since the time of Aristotle, metaphor has been in the focus of attention by scholars from such disciplines as linguistics, literary studies and philosophy. However, the research on metaphor and its influence on human knowledge has proliferated during the recent decades notably after the publication of seminal works by Lakoff & Johnson (1980) and Ortony (1993), which initiated a paradigm shift in metaphor studies. The emerged contemporary or conceptual metaphor theory (henceforth CMT) proposes that metaphor is not just an aspect of language but a fundamental part of human thought; our conceptual system consists of concepts which structure our everyday lives and the way we define our everyday realities [...] Metaphor plays a central role in this construction as our conceptual system is largely metaphorical (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:1-3). Therefore, metaphors are not only linguistic, but cognitive phenomena; metaphors are not decorative devices of language, but necessary for our thinking, acting and speaking; metaphors are *conceptual devices*, rather than rhetorical ones. As a result, metaphor has gone beyond the realm of linguistics and become a subject of thorough research in social sciences and other disciplines.

There are three components of metaphor: *a source domain* (which is typically *more concrete/tangible and well-delineated*), *a target domain* (which is usually *more abstract and poorly delineated*), and the ontological and epistemic correspondences between the two, which are also known as '*conceptual mappings*' (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980/2003; Lakoff, 1993; Grady, 1997; Kövecses, 2010; Thibodeau, Hendricks & Boroditsky, 2017). For illustration, in the conceptual metaphor LOVE IS A JOURNEY the concept of JOURNEY, the source, is mapped onto the concept of LOVE, the target. Such conceptual metaphors can be realized linguistically in the following utterances, such as *Our relationship has reached a cross-road* or *We have come to the end of the road* (Lakoff & Johnson 1980). Thus, it can be inferred that conceptual metaphors are overarching ways of conceptualizing relatively abstract ideas in more concrete form.

Metaphor is a dynamic process: prior knowledge about a source domain plays an active role in helping people construct a representation on a target domain in working memory; thereby shaping how people reason and make inferences about the target domain (Thibodeau, Hendricks,

Boroditsky, 2017: 3). Andreas Musolff introduces the notion of a ‘scenario’¹ that organizes metaphorical source concepts into mini-narratives and inherently possesses “a set of assumptions made by competent members of a discourse community about “typical” aspects of a source-situation, for example, its participants and their roles, the “dramatic” storylines and outcomes, and conventional evaluations of whether they count as successful or unsuccessful, normal or abnormal, permissible or illegitimate, etc. “ (Musolff, 2006: 27-28). Above all, scenarios have stereotypical status (in Putnam’s sense), i.e. they include conventionally required assumptions, which may be revealed by experts to be empirically wrong but are still the default expectations that underline folk-theories held by non-experts (Putnam, 1975: 148, 249-50, quoted in Musolff, 2008: 27). What is truly significant about these metaphorical scenarios is that they enable the speakers to not only apply source to target concepts but to draw on them to build narrative frames for conceptualization and assessment of socio-political issues (ibid. 36).

Metaphors are omnipresent; as Richard pointed “We can’t get through three sentences of ordinary fluid discourse without it [metaphor] (Richards, 1936: 94). For this reason, they cannot be dissociated from the activities constituting science (Bono, 2001:215). Weingart & Maasen (1995) regard metaphors to be analytical tools for a robust sociological account of science as a situated social activity. Moreover, the central tenet of their theory is the function of metaphors as “messengers of meaning” and “medium of exchange” among different disciplinary discourses, among different disciplines and cultural domains, and within different ecologies (Bono 1990 quoted in Nerlich et al., 2008: 225), which supports the conclusion that metaphor provides the means for both scientists and especially, non-scientists to understand, think through and talk about complex or abstract concepts in terms of comparatively simple and more concrete information , what as a consequence renders metaphor as a highly useful tool (Gibbs, 1994; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Lakoff, 1993; Lakoff, 1987; Kövecses, 2010; Thibodeau & Boroditsky, 2011; Thibodeau, Hendricks & Boroditsky, 2017; Flusberg, Thibodeau & Matlock, 2018).

From the linguistic viewpoint, metaphors, as claimed by Scheithauer (2007: 79), are also “very efficient: they communicate a lot with minimal linguistic effort, whereas attempts at literal paraphrases are often lengthy, clumsy and graceless”.

¹ Musolff builds the concept of “scenario” on Charles Fillmore’s notion of a conceptual “**scene**” as “any kind of coherent segment of human beliefs, actions, experiences or imaginings” that can be associated with an underlying conceptual “**frame**” (Fillmore, 1975, p. 124) as well as on Lakoff’s definition of “**scenario**” as a subtype of “idealized cognitive models” (ICMs) that have a comparatively rich ontology (Musolff, 2006: 27)

2. Framing diseases: General Overview

Lakoff & Johnson claimed that ‘metaphors [...] highlight and make coherent certain aspects of our experience [...]; metaphors may create realities for us, especially social realities (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980:156). Essentially, metaphors have profound influences on how we conceptualize and act with respect to important societal issues (Thibodeau & Boroditsky, 2011: 1). In political and social debates, metaphors are primarily ways of both framing the issues and of shaping the ways in which people think about them (Malik, 2020). In recent years, an interesting body of research in cognitive and social studies has been conducted by Zinken, Hellsten and Nerlich and other scholars as a part of the critique of the traditional conceptual metaphor theory. The research focused on *discourse metaphor* which is defined as ‘a relatively stable metaphorical projection that functions as a key framing device within a particular discourse over a certain period of time’ (Zinken et al., 2008). Unlike conceptual metaphors, which are claimed to be primarily based on more or less universal grounds (*embodiment hypothesis*), these metaphors have a social and cultural history and [...] may tie up with and reinforce long traditions of political thought, ideologies or entrenched cultural values (ibid.). By distinguishing between *discourse metaphors*- which frame social assemblages of thought, expression and action, and *conceptual metaphors* –which frame cognitive assemblages of thought, expression and action, the discursive politics of metaphor can be brought into the focus: discourse metaphors have a power to frame and organize shared narratives of politics and can constitute certain views of the world, society and how things work (Nerlich, 2001:116-117; Zinken et al, 2008). They are conceptually grounded but their meaning is also shaped by their use at a given time and in the context of a debate about a certain topic.

The discourses and metaphors used to frame diseases and epidemics have become a prominent subject within linguistics as well as the sociology of health and illness, and studies of such infectious diseases as AIDS, FMD, SARS, avian/bird flu and Zika have shown that disease language and action are closely linked, especially via metaphors, images and narratives, which evoke certain expectations, attitudes, scenarios and ways of acting upon them (Nerlich & Halliday, 2005: 57-8). As a result, the impact of metaphors in particular and social representations in general on thinking, talking and acting in the context of emerging infectious diseases, has been studied extensively and systematically by social scientists and communication scholars following from Susan Sontag’s influential work on cancer and tuberculosis (1979) and AIDS (1989) onward with

Ebola in the 1990s (Ungar, 1998; Joffe & Haarhoff, 2002), foot and mouth disease/FMD (Nerlich et al., 2002; Nerlich, 2004), SARS (Washer, 2004; Wallis and Nerlich, 2005), avian/bird flu/influenza (Nerlich and Halliday, 2007), swine flu (Nerlich and Koteyko, 2012), Zika (Nerlich et al, 2018), etc. Based on the results of these studies, it can be concluded that metaphors play an indisputably significant role in how we think and talk health, illness and medicine and they shape how we act, individually and collectively (Nerlich, 2020a). Metaphors can also be used to frame politics intended to manage the disease in question (Zinken et al, 2008: 243). Scientists and policymakers might use certain culturally available and historically entrenched metaphors to frame scientific discoveries or policies (ibid. 244).

As the research demonstrates, framing diseases in terms of the WARFARE scenario has become a common practice nowadays. On the one hand, the war frame is an effective way of grabbing people's attention and focusing it on the target problem; the fear evoked by military metaphors also makes them memorable and enduring (Flusberg, Thibodeau & Matlock, 2018: 12-13). This fear can motivate people to pay attention, change their beliefs, and take action about important social issues. For instance, the language of **war** can help people recognize the threat that diseases pose to public health, and, as a result, lead to increased funding for research on basic scientific questions about the underlying causes of diseases as well as the development of more effective treatments (Hodgkin, 1985; Petsko, 2001; quoted in Flusberg, Thibodeau & Matlock, 2018). On the other hand, the research shows that conceptualizing an emerging disease in terms of *an enemy in war* can have an adverse impact on measures taken to *fight* it. One of the examples is, undoubtedly, the UK response to Foot and Mouth Disease (henceforth, FMD): slaughtering, culling or killing all presumably infected animals, as well as healthy animals from adjoining farms, was seen as the only way to gain control of the disease and, more importantly, to maintain the UK's economically vital status as disease free (Nerlich et al, 2002: 1). This led to the number of exterminated animals reaching almost eight million. Likewise, framing cancer as *an "enemy" in a "war"* which has been found to reduce people's intentions to engage in self-limiting preventative behaviours (e.g. eating less red meat, smoking less, etc.) and to think that it would be harder for cancer patient to come to terms with their situation (Thibodeau, Hendricks, Boroditsky, 2017: 1).

Military thinking concentrates on the physical, sees control as central, and encourages the expenditure of massive resources to achieve dominance (Annas, 1995: 746). They can even arguably make it easier to sacrifice people and their rights (Ross, 1986: 18; quoted in Wallis &

Nerlich, 2005:2631). It is noteworthy, however, that conceptualizing diseases in terms of the WARFARE scenario was not always the case, as maintained by Bono:

‘Take, for example, the metaphors of ‘balance’ and ‘warfare’ that have characterized different epochs of medical thought in the West. The Hippocratic and Galenic ideals of health as a balance of humours, or active bodily fluids authorized a particular set of relationships between individual bodies, and their external environment, and led to the cultivation of certain regimes of bodily care and control. By contrast, the ‘embattled’ body of modern germ theory adopts a quite different set of relations to its hostile external environment and enforces on itself – and on society more generally – a stringent medicalized, socio-political regime’ (Bono, 2001: 225).

As has been proven, using the wrong policy framed by the wrong metaphor can have devastating social, economic, psychological and animal welfare consequences. In such contexts, the import of metaphor extends beyond individual cognition, into the realm of society and culture (Zinken, Hellsten & Nerlich, 2008: 243), this proving that metaphors are not only conceptual (as claimed by the traditional theorists of CMT) but also *social* and *cultural devices* (Nerlich et al, 2002: 91). On top of that, framing novel issues in terms of [...] certain [...] metaphors, that is as something well known, might [...] prevent us from seeing alternative solutions to a problem (Zinken et al. 2003:21-23) as “how we frame a problem often includes what range of solutions we see as possible (Conrad, 1997: 140 quoted in Zinken et al, 2003).

3. Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19)

Novel Coronavirus, also known as COVID-19, came to the focus of international attention in early January, 2020, after the reports of a viral atypical SARS-like pneumonia outbreak emerged in Wuhan, China. This initial outbreak attracted increased media attention and eventually, led the World Health Organization (henceforth the WHO) to issue an international alert on January, 31. However, its rapid diffusion and the dramatic increase of the number of countries with officially confirmed cases forced the WHO to categorize COVID-19 as a pandemic on March 11, 2020, the first pandemic caused by a coronavirus strain.

Undoubtedly, COVID-19 became a major news story in the world. The WARFARE scenario evoked in relation to the fight against the novel coronavirus was dominant in international community. As it is usually the case, a war starts with *the declaration of war*. In the present situation, the first was the Chinese president Xi Jinping who vowed *to wage a 'people's war' against the COVID-19 epidemic*(<https://medium.com/@lseideas/china-and-covid-19-a-shock-to-its-economy-a-metaphor-for-its-development-11b1e31e643c>) followed by the UK Prime Minister Boris Johnson who revealed his "battle plan" to kill off the deadly bug in the UK (<https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/11086449/army-on-standby-coronavirus-boris-johnson/>) and described the crisis related to coronavirus as a "*fight ... in which every one of us is directly enlisted*"(<https://metro.co.uk/2020/03/24/boris-johnsons-lockdown-statement-watched-26-5-million-coronavirus-crisis-breaks-broadcast-records-12447364/>) and the president of France, Emmanuel Macron who in his 20-minute address to people repeated multiple times "*We are at war*" (<https://www.politico.eu/article/emmanuel-macron-on-coronavirus-were-at-war/>).

Arguably, discourse metaphors related to the WARFARE scenario usually become attractors for cultural commonplaces, cultural myths and salient events of the past (Zinken et al. 2008:245). These metaphorical and cognitive constraints seem to be discursively embedded in a relatively stable reservoir of cultural myths and social representations available in social memory e.g. memories of past wars and past epidemics, or weeds, plagues, and displacements (ibid.), as well as natural or nuclear disasters and socio-political collapses, something that was well captured in one of the headlines of British newspapers: ***Could coronavirus be China's Chernobyl moment? Disaster set to spark COLLAPSE of communist party*** [in this case, the current ruling party in China] (<https://www.express.co.uk/news/world/1243359/Coronavirus-latest-news-China-Wuhan-Xi-Jinping-Communist-Party-Chernobyl>). The Queen Elizabeth II, in an extremely rare broadcast to the nation, invoked *wartime* spirit, the spirit of World War 2, to *defeat* coronavirus as she told the British public they will overcome the coronavirus outbreak if they stayed resolute in the face of the draconian measures taken to combat the virus (<https://www.express.co.uk/news/royal/1265566/queen-elizabeth-II-news-coronavirus-speech-update-royal-family-latest>).

Contemporary flu epidemics including the swine flu, otherwise called H1N1 were actively referenced along with the occasional comparisons with SARS (Severe Acute Respiratory

Syndrome) and MERS (Middle East respiratory syndrome) [other viruses related to the coronavirus strain] on a global scale including Georgia.

Other metaphors used to frame the novel coronavirus in the global community are related to the DISASTER scenario, which as studies demonstrate, are mainly used when the management of a disease goes beyond human control (Nerlich & Halliday, 2007: 60): conventionalized metaphorical expressions such as an *epicenter*, *tsunami* (about the cases), *house on fire*, etc. and their novel *elaborations* or *extensions* were actively employed (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980/2003; Lakoff & Turner, 1989; Kövecses, 2010)².

4. Methodology and Data

This paper aimed to analyze how Georgian media framed the discourse related to COVID-19 both in terms of the biosecurity issues and management of serious long-term economic repercussions of the stringent measures taken to contain the virus spread in the country.

The study draws on theoretical and methodological tenets from **CMT** (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980/2003; Lakoff, 1987; Lakoff, 1993; Lakoff & Turner, 1989; Grady, 1997; Kövecses, 2010), Andrea Musolf's concept of '**scenario**', **discourse metaphors** (Zinken, Hellsten, Nerlich, 2008) and their social representation and influence as well as **earlier studies on infectious diseases**, such as FMD, MERS, SARS, avian/bird flu, Ebola, Zika, along with cancer, HIV/AIDS, and tuberculosis.

Different qualitative approaches drawn from corpus linguistics and earlier metaphor studies were experimented with but found to be inadequate as the data was scarce, which may be attributed to the novelty of the pandemic. Therefore, the data come mainly from news reports about the novel coronavirus from one of the major TV channels in Georgia: *Rustavi 2* and a talk show “გიორგი თარგამაძის ფორმულა” (Giorgi Targamadze's Formula) aired on '*Formula*', February 29th, 2020. The analysis covered all news reports related to the situation in terms of novel coronavirus epidemic situation in Georgia, starting from the first confirmed case of COVID-19, i.e. February 26th, till May 12th, when the outbreak was on the wane and most restrictions were/ were about to be lifted. Overall, **2,348** news reports were thoroughly analysed, out of which **456** accounts (19.42 %) were found to contain metaphorical linguistic expressions related to COVID-19.

² For the full list of metaphors used globally, visit: <https://blogs.nottingham.ac.uk/makingsciencepublic/2020/03/17/metaphors-in-the-time-of-coronavirus/>

I focused on news reports as they are normally aimed at a wide audience and exert considerable influence on society. Their main purpose is to inform and provide the audience with as accurate information as possible about a particular event without having any of evaluative power. However, evaluation is unavoidable even in this field. Any news report is a complex communicative event that also embodies a *social* context, featuring participants (and their properties) as well as production and reception processes (Dijk, 1988: 1-2). What is more, the media is a space in which political actors “launch their frames”; in this sense, it is a “carrier for the frames of others” (Scheudele, 2004: 403).

The qualitative method standard in linguistic metaphor studies was used with adaptations to deal with the size of the data and the identification of metaphorical linguistic expressions in the texts and their corresponding conceptual metaphors and their analysis in the extended stretches of discourse. For the identification of metaphorical linguistic expressions, **the bottom-up approach**, otherwise called **inductive**, was chosen as this approach implies that no specific conceptual metaphor is presumed, and only at a later stage are mappings derived from the linguistic expressions that have been identified as metaphorically used (Krennmayr, 2013:10-11). A principal advantage of bottom-up analyses is that refraining from presuming conceptual metaphors, in spite of what is suggested by Lakoff & Johnson (1980), reduces the bias towards finding precisely those linguistic expressions that match the preconceived mapping (ibid). The examples of the inductive approach are robust methodology developed by Pragglejaz Group (2007) known as Metaphor Identification Procedure or MIP and later, its refined version, MIPVU established by Gerard Steen along with other scholars of Vrije University (hence VU) including Aletta G. Dorst, Tina Krennmayr, and others (Steen et al, 2010). Both MIP and MIPVU are reliable procedures for identifying linguistic metaphor which prevent the researcher from seeing ‘(...) concrete manifestations of conceptual metaphors everywhere’ (Steen, 2007: 27).

For the present purposes, the combination of MIP and MIPVU was employed. The steps involved in the analysis were as follows (Pragglejaz Group, 2007; Steen et al, 2010:25-26):

1. Read the entire text–discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.
2. Determine the lexical units in the text–discourse.
3. (a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context.
(b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context.

- (c) If the lexical unit has a more basic current–contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.
4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical.
 5. When a word is used indirectly and that use may potentially be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping from a more basic meaning of that word, mark the word as metaphorically used (MRW).
 6. When a word is used directly and its use may potentially be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping to a more basic referent or topic in the text, mark the word as direct metaphor (MRW, direct).
 7. When words are used for lexico-grammatical substitution, such as third person personal pronouns, or when ellipsis occurs where words may be seen as missing, as in some forms of co-ordination, and when a direct or indirect meaning is conveyed by those substitutions or ellipses that may potentially be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping from a more basic meaning, referent, or topic, insert a code for implicit metaphor (MRW, implicit).

Metaphorical expressions were identified in contexts surrounding the words related to the novel coronavirus (COVID-19, virus, pandemic, infection, challenge, etc.). For the identification of basic meanings of lexical items, Georgian online dictionary was used (available at <http://www.ice.ge/liv/liv/ganmartebiti.php>).

5. Results and Discussion

Georgian media covered the pandemic with a high degree of interest. The first case of COVID-19 was confirmed on February, 26 followed by the second on February 28 and third the next day. The closure of schools and universities, moving on the distance working and learning, self-isolation the surveillance of travellers and later travel bans were important methods used against the spread of the disease followed by the state of emergency, curfew and lockdown. As the research showed, such conceptualizations of security are linked to a rhetorical contrast between outside which is deemed to be dangerous, and the ‘inside’ which is locked down tightly, secured and safe (Chilton, 1996).

5.1. Coronavirus as a Target Domain

5.1.1. WARFARE Scenario

Metaphors related to the WARFARE scenario pervaded the discourse about the situation in terms of the novel coronavirus in Georgia both in discussions about the biosecurity (and biosecurity measures) and the aftermath of COVID-19 in terms of the country's economic sustainability. The prominence of their use was seen to have intensified along with the rise of COVID-19 infected patients, i.e. when the threat was more and more immediate to everybody.

The war scenario can be regarded as a super-scenario (Nerlich, 2011:11) that includes other sub-scenarios/mini-narratives which are interrelated and can be connected to other scenarios and form *discursive metaphor clusters* (Koller, 2003). Based on the present research, it can be concluded that Georgian WAR scenario in relation to COVID-19 situation subsumed the following concepts or sub-scenarios which actively interacted:

INVASION, BATTLE, FIGHT, HAND-TO-HAND COMBAT, ATTACK, DEFENCE, ENEMY, KILLER, HEROES, VICTIMS, FRONTLINE, VICTORY, DEFEAT, STRATEGY

Below I elaborate on each of the mini-narrative presenting each of them in square brackets.

The WARFARE scenario is a complex construct based on the basic conceptual metaphors, basic knowledge structures known as image schemas (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, Johnson, 1987) designated as CONTAINER and SOURCE-PATH-GOAL. These schemas activate a reassuringly familiar range of discourses and associated precautions emerged including 'locking down', 'sealing off', and 'closing' disinfecting, etc. In Georgia this scenario (apart from the measures mentioned above) included locking down the infected regions in order not to let the virus travel from the **red (infected) zones** into the **neutral (not/minimally infected) zones**, with the help of the military forces deployed on the borders of these areas. The government and experts did everything to contain the virus spread by isolating the suspects of harbouring the virus, Georgian citizens who returned to the country during this period were subject to the obligatory quarantine; the COVID-19 patients who got infected abroad but revealed the symptoms after their return to Georgia were

described as *imported cases*, i.e. *people who imported or transported the virus*, or as *the case which is brought from the outside*. This, in its turn, interacts with the JOURNEY scenario evoking a virus on a journey (see below). This scenario is also linked to the image schema of SOURCE-PATH-GOAL and includes the following sub-components (Nerlich, 2011:130; Koteyko, Brown and Crawford, 2008:253-4):

- A trajector that moves
- A source location (the starting point)
- A target or goal, an intended destination of the trajector
- A route from the source to the target
- The actual trajectory of motion
- The position of the trajector at a given time
- The direction of the trajector at that time
- The position of the trajector at a given time
- The actual final location of the trajector, which may or may not be the intended destination

On February 26, COVID-19 arrived in Georgia. On February 27th, Rustavi 2 reported

(1) GEO: კორონავირუსი უკვე საქართველოშია (<http://rustavi2.ge/ka/news/156542>)

[‘Coronavirus is already *in* Georgia]

thus evoking the sub-scenario of INVASION (WAR); THE ACTUAL FINAL LOCATION (JOURNEY)

Even though the news accounts contained more or less neutral language while reporting on the situation in Georgia, the increase in the number of confirmed cases fueled up an explosion of such metaphorical linguistic expressions as *to fight against the coronavirus a war on coronavirus, win/defeat this virus* [FIGHT, VICTORY, DEFEAT(WAR)];

- Rustavi 2 ran a series of headlines entitled conspicuously featuring the military atmosphere: ‘Georgia’s 22nd day of fight against the coronavirus’; ‘36th day of the fight against the coronavirus in Georgia’; “The Country is *in the first stage of its fight against the coronavirus*”;
- recovered patients were represented as the ones who *defeated the illness* [FIGHT, ENEMY, VICTORY(WAR)];, people who died were *defeated by the virus* or represented as *another victims of the virus* [ENEMY, KILLER, VICTORY, DEFEAT, VICTIM(WAR)];
- hospitals were *mobilized for the aggressive attacks* [STRATEGY, ATTACK, BATTLE, ENEMY(WAR)] from the patient affected by the novel coronavirus and doctors and experts were *the warriors and (heroes) on the front line* [FRONTLINE, HEROES (WAR)];
- ‘Stay at home’ was seen as a method of no alternative during *the fight against the COVID-19* and social distance *was the most powerful weapon to defeat the virus* [STRATEGY, BATTLE, FIGHT, DEFENCE, and ENEMY (WAR)].

Each patient affected by the novel coronavirus along with their doctors *waged a war* on the infection [STRATEGY, BATTLE, FIGHT, DEFENCE, ENEMY, VICTORY (WAR)]; at some intervals it was said that *the war was being won*, which is present in the following quote of one of the doctors, working with COVID-19 infected patient who had just recovered from a critical condition:

- (2) GEO: *ამ ომში მეტნაკლებად გავიმარჯვეთ, ვინაიდან პაციენტი კონტაქტური და ადეკვატური გახდა. შესაძლოა, პაციენტი დღის ბოლომდე მოიხსნას აპარატიდან* (<http://rustavi2.ge/ka/news/159793>):

[*We more or less won this war* because the patient became contact and conscious. The patient may be removed from the ventilator by the end of the day.]

Interestingly, the KILLER scenario, usually considered to be particularly dominant in discussions of the nature of diseases (e.g. as it was with SARS (Wallis & Nerlich, 2005), was

almost minimally used; even when employed, the killing function of the virus was either refuted or described as ‘eliminated’, e.g.:

- (3) GEO: ის, რომ COVID-19 მკვლელი არ არის, ამ ქალბატონის მაგალითზე შემძღვია ვთქვა. აზრი იმის შესახებ, რომ კორონავირუსი მკვლელია, სიმართლეს არ შეესაბამება (<http://rustavi2.ge/ka/news/159793>)

[The fact that COVID-19 is not a *killer* can be seen on the example of this woman (a COVID-19 patient) [...]. The idea that the novel coronavirus is a *killer* is not true]

- (4) GEO: დიდი ხანია, ამ ვირუსის ბუნებათა შესახებ არაფერი მითქვამს, იმიტომ რომ, როგორც კი სამყაროში გაჩნდა ეს ვირუსი, რატომღაც, ყველამ, ვინაიდან ახალი იყო და მაღალი ლეტალობა იყო კაცობრიობაში, მკვლელი დავარქვით, მაგრამ ამ ვირუსმა, ამ ფუნქციის ლიკვიდაცია განიცადა (<http://web1.rustavi2.ge/ka/news/163030>).

[For a long time, I have not said anything about the nature of this virus, because as soon as this virus appeared in the world, for some reason, we all called it a *killer*, due to its novelty and high lethality in humanity, but this virus *has eliminated this function*.]

The marginal role of this metaphor may be attributed to the low mortality rate in Georgia.

The WARFARE scenario became also dominant in Georgian discourse about structuring the management of the pandemic and handling the emerging economic crisis. The military atmosphere was well captured in the following extract from the speech delivered by the Prime Minister of Georgia, Giorgi Gakharia, on April, 1 invoking the sub-scenarios of ENEMY, STRATEGY, BATTLE, FIGHT, and VICTORY (WAR):

- (5) GEO: ეს არის ომი უხილავ მტერთან, რომელშიც არავის აქვს გამარჯვების შანსი ერთიანობის გარეშე. [...] ვირუსთან ბრძოლაში მთავრობის ძირითადი სტრატეგიული და ტაქტიკური ნაბიჯებია მაღალი რანგის პროფესიონალების მაქსიმალური ჩართულობა და სწრაფი, ეფექტური და დროული მენეჯმენტი. [...] ეს არის ბრძოლა, ომი უხილავ მტერთან, რომელშიც არც ერთ მთავრობას,

საქართველოზე უფრო ძლიერ სისტემურ ქვეყნებშიც, გამარჯვების შანსი არ აქვს, თუ არ გაერთიანდება, ყველა, სახელმწიფო, სამოქალაქო სექტორი, თითოეული მოქალაქე. (<http://rustavi2.ge/ka/news/1597934>)

[*This is a war with an invisible enemy, in which no one has a chance to win without unity[...] the main strategic and tactical steps of the government in the fight against the virus are the maximum involvement of high-ranking professionals and fast, efficient and timely management. [...] This is a battle; a war with an invisible enemy, in which no government, even in more systemic countries than Georgia, has a chance to win unless everybody, the state, the civil society, each citizen, is united.*]

As it can be seen, in this extract, the WAR frame focuses on the novel coronavirus as the personification of an invisible enemy that needs to be defeated, which proved to be a major rhetorical device for reporting on COVID-19 (and earlier for both SARS and FMD (Nerlich, 2011)). The government spoke about *strategy, tactics* and being *on a high alert* [STRATEGY, BATTLE, FIGHT, and ENEMY (WAR)]; ready to *engage in hand-to-hand combat* with the virus and its economic consequences by drawing up *a battle plan to defend the people against the enemy* and establishing *a fight-against-coronavirus* foundation to raise money.

Economy and especially, the currency, **Georgian lari**, which dropped sharply during the period, were metonymically personified as victims of the *strikes* and *blows* from COVID-19 [FIGHT, DEFEAT, VICTIM (WAR)], particularly due to the restrictions imposed to contain the virus spread. For illustration:

(6) GEO: საქართველოში კორონავირუსის პირველი მსხვერპლი ლარია.

(<http://rustavi2.ge/ka/news/159202>)

[The first *victim* of the coronavirus is Georgian Lari]

The tourism sector, which is an increasingly important component of the country's economy, suffered most as the pandemic closed most of the hotels and turned part of them into quarantine spaces, which led to great financial loss and became one of the main targets for *blows* from the novel coronavirus [BATTLE, FIGHT, ENEMY, TARGET, VICTIM (WAR)]:

(7) GEO: "COVID 19"-მა ყველაზე დიდი დარტყმა ტურიზმს მიაყენა.

(<http://web1.rustavi2.ge/ka/news/162743>)

["COVID 19" *dealt the biggest blow* to tourism]

The WARFARE scenario persisted strongly in the media throughout the whole period.

5.1.2. JOURNEY Scenario

There were two metaphoric journeys in Georgia: one taken *by the virus* (specifically its *spread*) and another one – *by the country* as a whole (the government, experts and people).

5.1.2.1. The Virus on a Journey

In the context of viral spread and viral infection, the JOURNEY scenario was signaled by the use of the discourse metaphors such as THE APPEARANCE OF A VIRUS IS AN INVASION (which is in turn, a part of the WAR scenario and THE SPREAD OF A VIRUS IS A JOURNEY³).

The JOURNEY scenario initially focused on the spread of COVID-19 via people returning or visiting the country. As it was mentioned above, the virus *arrived in* Georgia on February 26th from Azerbaijan (the first patient entered the country from Azerbaijan), the second and third cases were from Italy. By the end of March the virus got through or, as it was frequently remarked, *was brought or imported* (see above) to Georgia from different countries so that

(8) GEO: გეოგრაფია საკმაოდ გაფართოვდა შემოტანილი შემთხვევებით

(<http://rustavi2.ge/ka/news/159143>)

[*The geography has expanded considerably* in terms of the *imported* cases]

As a result, the virus was spread inside the country and the internal transmission of COVID-19 was detected, what marked the starting point of the virus spread phase in Georgia.

Interestingly, all these caused the outbursts of xenophobia and hatred from the local people towards foreign visitors as well as the Georgian citizens who had just returned to the country,

³ such an interplay of different scenarios has been called *the network of scenarios* (Koteyko, Brown and Crawford, 2008:251)

respectively; as an illustration, on March 14th, as explained by the fear of the novel coronavirus, locals in Kutaisi confronted Polish citizens and demanded the head of the family hotel where the tourists were accommodated that he expelled them. Another case happened in Batumi, where the locals disapproved of the decision of the local officials to put Georgians who had just come back under obligatory quarantine in the hotel located in their vicinities.

The prominence of the use of JOURNEY metaphors was seen when COVID-19 spread was about to *reach* a so-called peak phase, e.g.:

- (9) GEO: საქართველოში კორონავირუსის გავრცელება პიკს აპრილის ბოლოს მიაღწევს (<http://rustavi2.ge/ka/news/160723>)

[The spread of coronavirus in Georgia *will reach its peak* at the end of April]

At the beginning of May when the peak was considered to be on the wane, the fear related to the second appearance of COVID-19 was still seen by the experts:

- (10) GEO: ახალი კორონავირუსი ამ დრომდე შეუსწავლელია, ამიტომ ის შეიძლება ნებისმიერ დროს შემოუბრუნდეს ქვეყანას (<http://web1.rustavi2.ge/ka/news/164161>)

[The novel coronavirus has not yet been well studied, so it can *return to the country* at any time]

5.1.2.2. *The Country on a Journey*

The journey of the country was related to the different stages Georgia had to go through during COVID-19. The metaphors used to feature this journey represented an overlap of two image schemas (Lakoff & Turner, 1986): CONTAINER/BOUNDED REGION and SOURCE-PATH-GOAL (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980/2003; Johnson, 1987; Lakoff, 1987). Each phase was conceptualized as a CONTAINER which the country *approached*, *entered*, *went through*, and finally *crossed* or *got over*.

The stages or ‘phases’ included: containment/delay phase, spread phase, critical phase, peak phase, and mitigation phase

The linguistic instances of this JOURNEY scenario with the overlapping image schemata are given in the following quotes:

- (11) GEO: კორონავირუსის შეჩერების ეტაპიდან გადავდივართ გავრცელების ეტაპზე (<http://rustavi2.ge/ka/news/158375>)

[From the delay phase we are *moving into* the spread phase]

- (12) GEO: ქვეყანა კორონა ვირუსის პიკს უახლოვდება (<http://rustavi2.ge/ka/news/161318>)

[The country is *approaching* the peak]

- (13) GEO: ქვეყანა კორონავირუსის გავრცელების პიკში შედის (<http://web1.rustavi2.ge/ka/news/163078>)

[The country is *entering* the peak of the coronavirus spread]

- (14) GEO:მატება ერთნიშნა ციფრს არ აღემატება, თუ ასე გაგრძელდა, პიკი გადალახულია (<http://web1.rustavi2.ge/ka/news/164114>)

[The increase does not exceed the single-digit number, if this continues; the peak is going to be *overcome*]

5.1.3. Peaks, Plateaus and Zigzags: Landscape Metaphors of the Pandemic

The pandemic metaphors tried to bring math, modeling and graphs down to earth, such as flattening or crushing the curve (Nerlich, 2020b) which were used worldwide.⁴ In Georgia, these metaphors were prevalent when the country *entered* a so-called critical phase and was about to *embark on its journey to the 'peak'*, thus evoking what Brigitte Nerlich in her recent article (published May 6th, 2020) designated as *Landscape Metaphors of the pandemic* (see <https://blogs.nottingham.ac.uk/makingsciencepublic/2020/05/06/pandemic-landscapes-peaks-and-tunnels-waves-and-plateaus/>) and again the JOURNEY scenario described above, particularly its sub-component CLIMBING A MOUNTAIN. Some of the linguistic instantiation of this network of metaphor scenarios are present in the following quote of one of the epidemiologists who tried to

⁴ see Brigitte Nerlich's blog on the metaphor "Flattening the curve":
<https://blogs.nottingham.ac.uk/makingsciencepublic/2020/03/10/flattening-the-curve-to-curb-an-epidemic/>

predict the future of this ‘peak’ [PEAK, PLATEAU, GOING DOWN THE MOUNTAIN, VIRUS ON A JOURNEY (JOURNEY)]:

(15) GEO: [...] შემდეგ მივალწევთ პიკს, ეს პიკი მინდა, რომ იყოს პლატო და არა ძალიან ციცაბო. შემდეგ ეს პლატო გაგრძელდება სავარაუდოდ ორი-სამი კვირა და შემდეგ უნდა წავიდეს დაღმავალი გზით ეპიდემია.

(<http://web1.rustavi2.ge/ka/news/162980>)

[[...] Then, we will *reach the peak*, I want this *peak not to be too steep* but a *plateau*. Then, this *plateau* will probably last for two to three weeks and after that, the epidemic *should go downhill*]

As the epidemic unfolded and the country was ‘*approaching*’ the peak, the main concern of the medical experts and government officials was to have a ‘*short*’ or ‘*flattened*’ peak, *a hill* and not a *mountain* like *Everest*, so as to avoid the healthcare system overload:

(16) GEO: ჩვენ პიკი არ უნდა გვქონდეს *ვერესტის* ტოლი. შეიძლება პიკი იყოს *ვერესტი* და იყოს *ბორცვი*. ჩვენთვის მთავარია, პიკი იმდენად *დაბრტყელდეს* და იმდენად ცოტა შემთხვევა იყოს *პიკის* დროს, რომ ამან არ მოახდინოს არც ჯანდაცვის სისტემის გადატვირთვა. (<http://rustavi2.ge/ka/news/161483>)

[We should not have a *peak* equal to *Everest*. The *peak* may be *Everest* and be a *hill*. The most important thing for us is that the *peak* is so *flattened* and there are so few cases during the *peak* that it does not cause any overload of the healthcare system.]

The Minister of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied Territories, Labour, Health and Social Affairs of Georgia further exploited the ‘math scenario’ and introduced a new metaphor ‘*zigzag*’ as a mark of the changeable figures of confirmed cases for each day. For illustration:

(17) GEO: ჩვენ არ გვაქვს არც პლატო და არც ვაკე, გვაქვს *ტეხილი* და შეგვიძლია შემოვიტანოთ ახალი ტერმინი, რომელიც ყოველ დღეს აღნიშნავს მნიშვნელოვნად განსხვავებულ რიცხვებს (<http://web1.rustavi2.ge/ka/news/163572>)

[We have neither a *plateau* nor a *plain*, we have a *zigzag* and we can introduce a new term that marks significantly different numbers each day]

5.1.4. *DISASTER Scenario*

Apart from WAR and JOURNEY, another scenario that was salient in the coverage of COVID-19 was that of the DISASTER. However, in reporting on the situation in Georgia, the corresponding metaphors were used to a lesser degree compared to the two previous scenarios. Metaphors of a storm, an earthquake, flood and fire evoke so-called natural disasters over which scientists and policymakers have arguably no control (Nerlich & Halliday, 2007: 60). By contrast, Georgia was one of those countries where the government and medical experts more or less succeeded in controlling the situation as compared to the rest of the world.

At the beginning, the only metaphor which was sporadically employed by the media and experts was related to the sub-scenario of TSUNAMI, mainly describing the well-preparedness of the government and healthcare system: the conventionalized linguistic expressions, such as: *first/second wave, to curb the wave* (GEO: პირველი/მეორე ტალღა, ტალღის შეკავება) were used. For illustration:

- (18) GEO: ჩვენ მოვამზადეთ სისტემა იმისათვის, რომ მიგველო პირველი ტალღა (<http://rustavi2.ge/ka/news/158397>)

[We have prepared the system for *the first wave*]

- (19) GEO: ჩვენ ეპიდემიის პირველი ტალღის შეკავება მოვახერხეთ (<http://rustavi2.ge/ka/news/158821>)

[We managed to *contain/curb the first wave* of the epidemic]

- (20) GEO: კორონავირუსის მეორე ტალღამდე გამოცხადებული საგანგებო მდგომარეობის მოთხოვნები განსაკუთრებით მკაცრი არაა. (<http://rustavi2.ge/ka/news/158848>)

[The demands of state of emergency declared before *the second wave* of coronavirus are not particularly strict]

However, there was a sudden increase in the use of the DISASTER metaphors in mid-April when the country entered a so-called ‘critical phase’. The lexical items included:

- (21) GEO: ვირუსის ეპიდაფეთქება
[Engl., Epidemic explosion or epidexplosion, *verbatim*, transl. *outbreak*];

- (22) GEO: ზვავისებური გავრცელება
[Engl., *avalanche-like spread of the disease, verbatim*];
- (23) GEO: დადგება მომენტი, შეწყვეტს ვირუსი ბოზოქრობას
(<http://rustavi2.ge/ka/news/161078>)
[Engl., *The moment will come when the virus stops storming*];
- (24) GEO: როცა ჩაცხრება ბოზოქარი ვირუსი, მერე ვიქეიფოთ
(<http://web1.rustavi2.ge/ka/news/161569>) [Engl., *when the storming virus calms down, then we will party*]

This brief upsurge seems to have been triggered by the fact that the handle of the situation went out of experts' control as the number of confirmed cases rose and the epidemiologists were no longer able to trace the source of transmission.

5.2. Coronavirus as a Source Domain

In his recent article in *the Observer*, Kenan Malik (see <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/mar/15/like-a-moth-to-a-flame-we-are-drawn-to-metaphors-to-explain-our-world>) mentioned that 'The coronavirus is both a physical threat and a metaphor for everything from the failures of globalization to the menace of foreigners'.

Here, as an illustration I show how the novel coronavirus primed the subsequent discourse on the Georgian political system. The samples come from the speech given by a journalist and former politician, Giorgi Targamadze⁵, who in his weekly programme (გიორგი თარგამაძის ფორმულა (Giorgi Targamadze's Formula) compared COVID-19 with a different virus which seemed to have infected the Georgian political system. The programme covered two pressing topics circulating in Georgia during February, 2020: first, COVID-19, which was already here, and second, the approaching parliamentary elections, specifically the electoral system, which was the point of

⁵ I would like to offer my huge thank to Giorgi Targamadze who kindly allowed me to publish these extracts from his programme.

contention among the ruling and opposing parties. Having finished talking about the coronavirus, he moved to the topic of yet unreached agreement over the format of coming parliamentary elections and government's failure to keep the promise to hold parliamentary elections under the proportional system instead of the existing two methods, thus yielding a metaphor **GEORGIAN POLITICAL SYSTEM IS AN INFECTED ORGANISM**⁶:

(25) GEO: ვირუსზე საუბარი უნდა გავაგრძელო, [...] ოღონდ ამ შემთხვევაში საუბარი არის ჩვენი პოლიტიკური სისტემის ავადმყოფობაზე. [...], თითქოს ყველაფერი ვიცით რა გვჭირს ამ მხრივ, მთელი ამ წლების განმავლობაში და მიზეზი არის ჩვენი პოლიტიკური სისტემის დაუბალანსებლობა. თითქოს წამალიც საყოველთაოდ ცნობილია და ამას არც მსოფლიო ჯანდაცვის ორგანიზაცია და გაერო არ გვჭირდება, მაგრამ მაინც ვერ ვშველით საკუთარ თავს.

[I need to proceed talking about virus. However, in this case I am considering the *sickness* of our political system. For all these years, we are aware of what we are *infected with* and *the reason* for it is the imbalance of our political system. *The medicine* is widely known and we need neither *WHO* nor *UNO*. Nevertheless, we still can't *help* ourselves.]

In this extract, it is obvious that the host of the programme actively evokes the current frame related to the novel coronavirus and creatively draws parallels between COVID-19 and the virus which infected the Georgian political system:

On the one hand, there is COVID-19 which is relatively unknown (unresearched), for which there is no cure yet, WHO is engaged in the process of handling the situation worldwide, but still, despite the efforts, nobody can manage the disease. On the other hand, there is another virus that infected the Georgian political system: we know almost everything about it, there IS the cure for this virus and it is widely known and has been tested in other countries and on many societies in terms of its efficacy, but still, we can't help ourselves:

(26) GEO: [...] პოლიტიკური პატიმრების არსებობა და სხვა ბევრი მიზეზია, რამაც საარჩევნო სისტემაზე შეთანხმებას ხელი შეიძლება შეუშალოს. თუმცა, პროცესის ყველა პასუხისმგებლიან მოთამაშეს ისიც ესმის, რომ ჩვენი ქვეყნის პოლიტიკური იმუნიტეტის მდგრადობისთვის სამართლიან საარჩევნო

⁶ According to the existing conventions, conceptual metaphors are normally typographically rendered in small capital letters.

მოდელზე შეთანხმება სასიცოცხლო მნიშვნელობისაა. ეს ის შემთხვევაა, როცა ყველამ წინასწარ და ნათლად ვიცით, არა მარტო ის თუ რა ვირუსი ჭირს ქართულ პოლიტიკურ სისტემას, არამედ ამდენი ხანი ქვეყანას მდგრადი განვითარების საშუალებას რომ არ აძლევს, არამედ, კორონავირუსისგან განსხვავებით, *სამკურნალო წამალიც დიდი ხანია გამოგონილია და არაერთ სხვა ქვეყანასა და საზოგადოებაზე გამოცდილი და მაღალ ეფექტურობაზე შემოწმებული.* ⁷

[There are various reasons, among others, the existence of political prisoners that hinder the reaching of an agreement over the election system. However, every player responsible for the process realizes that the agreement over the fair election model is vital for *the sustainability of our political immunity*. This is the case when everybody is aware not only of the *virus* Georgian political system *is infected with*, but also that it does not give the opportunity for the country to develop sustainably; unlike with the novel coronavirus, even *the medicine is invented long ago and tested in many countries and on different societies for its high efficacy.*]

From these extracts, it can be concluded that the topic of previous discourse primes Targamadze to further exploit the context and frame a new topic by staying within the same scenario. This is an example of what Kövecses calls contextually based or context-induced metaphors, “a new type of conceptual metaphors which “reveal an aspect of human creativity in conceptualizing of the world” (Kövecses, 2015: 116). The reason that prompted the host to use this metaphor must be the immediate social setting (Kövecses, 2015:109-110): there is a particular social setting (global context-COVID -19 epidemic [the programme was aired on February 29, i.e. before the COVID-19 was categorized as the pandemic], WHO along with almost every country were trying to find/invent a cure and vaccine; local context-the novel coronavirus reached Georgia 4 days before the programme and the government and medical experts were working in tandem to handle the emerged crisis) and there is a particular target domain (Georgian political system and the unclear future of the parliamentary elections) and its meaning that needs to be activated. If the meaning can be activated by means of a metaphorical mapping that fits the actual social setting, the speaker will

⁷ I ignored other metaphors used in this extract as, based on the present purposes, they were of no importance.

prefer to choose that mapping. Simply put, if the actual social setting involves an element that is an instance of an appropriate source domain, speakers are likely to use that source domain (ibid.).

In addition, the selection of this particular scenario (VIRUS, INFECTED ORGANISM) may also be caused by the contextual factors surrounding this discourse (Georgian political system), which can influence the speaker to decide on the particular framing of an issue in the given context as the choice or creation of one particular metaphor over another would be ensure **coherence** within ‘the contextual factors functioning as primes’ (Kövecses, 2015: 192).

6. Conclusion

To summarize, three major metaphor scenarios/superscenarios were identified to structure the discourse of COVID -19 in Georgia: WARFARE, which has long been seen as prime features of discourses of bioscience and disease (Walliss & Nerlich, 2005: 2637), JOURNEY (including CLIMBING A MOUNTAIN) and DISASTER. The study also showed that the same issue may be metaphorized in various ways. The selection of one of the metaphors instead of another is a social and cultural phenomenon, and it depends on the contexts of the use as well as the purpose of the users (Zinken et al, 2003: 18). Frequently, a network of scenarios was creatively exploited in the news reports, which proved to be an effective tool of rendering them intelligible and newsworthy to the public. Moreover, the novel coronavirus proved to be an effective source domain for already existing or emerging problems in society.

In conclusion, it can be said that the purpose of this study was primarily to show that metaphors are main tools in crossing the disciplinary discourses; they can expand our vision and provide insights denied to more literal thinking. Metaphors are cognitive as well as social phenomena. The research demonstrated that they can directly shape the public policy and lead people to the recognition of the measures taken as correct and sensible. Scenarios provide important narrative and discursive framing devices for journalists, but, as we have seen, also for scientists and policymakers. Metaphors construct, or frame, views of reality, which can be used in policymaking and planning (Koteyko, Brown, And Crawford, 2008: 258-9).

However, it should be noted that the results on which the conclusions are drawn are only symptomatic of this sample, but may serve as an incentive for further research. A further study on the novel coronavirus related metaphors including different mediums (e.g. pictorial metaphors) is

undoubtedly needed to obtain an overall picture of the COVID-19 metaphORIZATION. For the future study, it would be also interesting to research how the COVID-19 infected patients frame the virus as this can be a major contribution to the theory of framing diseases.

References

1. Annas, 1995: Annas, G. (1995). Reframing the debate on health care reform by replacing our metaphors. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 332(11), pp 744–747
2. Bono, 2001: Bono. (2001). Why metaphor? Towards a metaphoric of scientific practice. In: Sabine Maasen and Matthias Winterhager (eds.), *Science Studies: Probing the Dynamics of Scientific Knowledge*, pp 215–234. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
3. Dijk, 1988: Van Dijk, T (1988). *News Analysis*. LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, PUBLISHERS.Hillsdale, New Jersey. pp. 1-30.
4. Fillmore, 1975: Fillmore, C. J. (1975). An alternative to checklist theories of Meaning. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 1, pp 123–131.
5. Flusberg, Thibodeau & Matlock, 2018: Flusberg, Thibodeau & Matlock (2018).War Metaphors in Public Discourse.In *Metaphor and Symbol*. pp 2-44.
6. Grady, 1997: Grady, J. (1997). *Foundations of meaning: Primary metaphors and primary scenes*. Ph.D. diss., University of California at Berkeley
7. Joffe &Haarhoff, 2002: Joffe, H, Haarhoff, G. (2002). Representations of far-flung illnesses: the case of Ebola in Britain. *Social Science & Medicine*. Volume 54, Issue 6, pp 955-969.
8. Johnson, 1987: Johnson, M. (1987) *The Body in the Mind*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
9. Koller, 2003: Koller, V. (2003). Metaphor clusters, metaphor chains: Analyzing the multifunctionality of metaphor in text. *Metaphorik.de*, 5, pp 115–134.
10. Koteyko, 2009: Koteyko, Brown, Crawford & Carter. (2009). *Hygiene and Biosecurity: The Language and Politics of Risk in an Era of Emerging Infectious Diseases*. Appeared in *Sociology Compass*.
11. Koteyko, Brown and Crawford, 2008: Koteyko, Brown and Crawford (2008). The Dead Parrot and the Dying Swan: The Role of Metaphor Scenarios in UK Press Coverage of Avian flu in the UK in 2005–2006*Metaphor and Symbol*, pp 23: 242–261. online DOI: 10.1080/10926480802426787
12. Kövecses, 2010: Kövecses, Z.(2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
13. Kövecses, 2015: Kövecses, Z. (2015). *Where Metaphors Come From. Reconsidering Context in Metaphor*. OUP

14. Krennmayr, 2013: Krennmayr, T. (2013). Top-down versus bottom-up approaches to the identification of metaphor in discourse. Published in, *metaphorik.de*, No. 24, pp 7-36. ISSN 1618-2006.
15. Lakoff & Johnson, 1980/2003: Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980/2003) *Metaphors We Live By*. The University of Chicago Press
16. Lakoff, 1987: Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, fire and dangerous things*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
17. Lakoff & Turner, 1989: Lakoff, G. & Turner, M. (1989). – *More Than Cool Reason. A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. The University Of Chicago Press. 1989
18. Lakoff, 1993: Lakoff, G. (1993). *The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor*. Appeared in Andrew Ortony, ed., *Metaphor Thought*, pp 202-251. Cambridge University Press.
19. Lakoff, 2013: Lakoff, G. (1993). *The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor*. Appeared in Andrew Ortony, ed., *Metaphor Thought*, pp 202-251. Cambridge University Press.
20. Maasen & Weingart, 1995: Maasen & Weingart. (1995). *Metaphors-Messengers of Meaning*. *Science Communication*, Vol. 17. No 1, pp 9-31.
21. Musolff, 2006: Musolff, A. (2006). *Metaphor scenarios in public discourse*. *Metaphor and Symbol* 2(1), pp. 23-38.
22. Musolff, 2016: Musolff, A. (2016). *Political Metaphor Analysis*. *Discourse and Scenarios*. Bloomsbury
23. Nerlich & Halliday, 2007: Nerlich, B. and C. Halliday (2007). *Avian flu: The creation of expectations in the interplay between science and the media*. *Sociology of Health and Illness* 29(1), pp 46-65.
24. Nerlich & Koteyko, 2012: Nerlich, B. and Koteyko, N. (2012). *Crying wolf? Biosecurity and metacommunication in the context of the 2009 swine flu pandemic*. *Health & Place* 18(4), pp 710-717
25. Nerlich, 2011: Nerlich, B (2011). *The role of metaphor scenarios in disease management discourses: Foot and mouth disease and avian influenza*. *Windows to the Mind: Metaphor, Metonymy and Conceptual Blending*. pp 115-142
26. Nerlich et al., 2018: Ribeiro, Hartley, Nerlich, Jaspal. (2018). *Media coverage of the Zika crisis in Brazil: The construction of a 'war' frame that masked social and gender inequalities*. *Soc Sci Med*. 2018; pp 200:137-144. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.01.023

27. Nerlich, 2002: Nerlich, B., Hamilton, C. and Rowe, V. (2002). Conceptualising foot and mouth disease: The socio-cultural role of metaphors, frames and narratives. *Metaphorik.de*, Vol. 2: <http://www.metaphorik.de/02/nerlich.htm> (Retrieved on 10/04/2020).
28. Potts, A., & Semino, E. (2019). Cancer as Metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 34: 2, 81-95.
29. Pragglejazz Group, 2007: Pragglejazz Group. (2007). MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse. Appeared in *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22 (1), pp 1-39.
30. Richards , 1936: Richards, I. A. (1936). *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. New York and London: Oxford University Press.
31. Scheithauer, 2007: Scheithauer, Rut. 2007. Metaphor in election night television coverage in Britain, the United States and Germany. In Anita Fetzer & Gerda Eva Lauerbach (eds.), *Political discourse in the media*, pp 75–106. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
32. Semino, E. 2008. *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
33. Sontag, 1979: Sontag, S. (1979). *Illness as Metaphor*, London: Allen Lane.
34. Steen et al., 2010: Steen, Gerard J., Aletta G. Dorst, J. Berenike Herrmann, Anna A. Kaal & Tina Krennmayr. 2010. Metaphor in usage. *Cognitive Linguistics* 21 (4). pp 765–796.
35. Steen , 2007: Steen, G. (2007). Finding Metaphor in Discourse, *Pragglejazz and Beyond*. CULTURE, LANGUAGE AND REPRESENTATION · ISSN 1697-7750 · VOL. V \, pp. 9-25
36. Steen , 2009: Steen, G. J. (2009). From linguistic form to conceptual structure in five steps: analyzing metaphor in poetry. In G. Brône & J. Vandaele (Eds.), *Cognitive poetics*, pp. 197-226. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
37. Thibodeau & Boroditsky, 2011: Thibodeau PH, Boroditsky L (2011) Metaphors We Think With: The Role of Metaphor in Reasoning. *PLoS ONE* 6(2): e16782. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0016782
38. Thibodeau, Hendricks & Boroditsky, 2017: Thibodeau, P. H., Hendricks, R. K., & Boroditsky, L. (2017). How Linguistic Metaphor Scaffolds Reasoning. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 21(11), pp 852–863. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2017.07.001>
39. Ungar, 1998; Ungar, S. (1998). Hot Crises and Media Reassurance: A Comparison of Emerging Diseases and Ebola Zaire. *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 49, No. 1, pp. 36-56

40. Wallis & Nerlich, 2005: Wallis, P. and Nerlich, B. (2005). Disease metaphors in new epidemics: The UK media framing of the 2003 SARS epidemic. *Social Science & Medicine*, 60, pp. 2629-2639.
41. Zinken et al, 2008: Zinken, J., Hellsten, I., Nerlich, B., (2008). Discourse metaphors. In: Frank, R. M., Dirven, R., Ziemke, T., Bernardez, E., ed. *Body, Language and Mind*. vol. 2: Sociocultural situatedness. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 363-386.
42. Zinken et al. 2003: Zinken, Hellsten & Nerlich. (2003). What is “Cultural” about Conceptual Metaphors? Published in *International Journal of Communication* vol. 13, pp 5-29.

Web resources

1. Nerlich, 2020a: <https://blogs.nottingham.ac.uk/makingsciencepublic/2020/03/17/metaphors-in-the-time-of-coronavirus/> [Accessed on 19.03.2020]
2. Nerlich, 2020b: <https://blogs.nottingham.ac.uk/makingsciencepublic/2020/05/06/pandemic-landscapes-peaks-and-tunnels-waves-and-plateaus/> [Accessed on 10.05.2020]
3. Malik, 2020: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/mar/15/like-a-moth-to-a-flame-we-are-drawn-to-metaphors-to-explain-our-world> [Accessed on 20.03.2020]
4. <https://medium.com/@lseideas/china-and-covid-19-a-shock-to-its-economy-a-metaphor-for-its-development-11b1e31e643c> [Accessed on 25.03.2020]
5. <https://www.politico.eu/article/emmanuel-macron-on-coronavirus-were-at-war/> [Accessed on 27.03.2020]
6. <https://www.theguardian.com/news/audio/2020/feb/25/could-coronavirus-be-china-chernobyl-moment-podcast> [Accessed on 25.03.2020]
7. <https://metro.co.uk/2020/03/24/boris-johnsons-lockdown-statement-watched-26-5-million-coronavirus-crisis-breaks-broadcast-records-12447364> [Accessed on 25.03.2020]

Author’s email: niritspukhova@gmail.com

Author’s biographical data

I am a PhD student at Tbilisi State University researching metaphor in context. I have been teaching English since 2013 and have an extensive experience of teaching English to multi-level and exam-oriented classrooms. Currently I work as an ESL teacher in British Council Georgia. I

hold CELTA (Certificate in English Language to Adults) and TYLEC (Teaching Young Learners Extension Certificate, provided by Trinity College London).