

Maciej BACHRYJ 

Uniwersytet Wrocławski

[maciej.bachryj-krzywaznia@uwr.edu.pl](mailto:maciej.bachryj-krzywaznia@uwr.edu.pl)

# THE USE OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR IN THE INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE

## WHAT CAN A POLITICAL SCIENTIST LEARN FROM A COGNITIVE LINGUIST<sup>1</sup>?

**ABSTRACT:** This article considers the possibility of integrating conceptual metaphor theory (CMT), developed within the realm of cognitive linguistics, with an interpretive approach to political science. The author demonstrates that the theoretical tenets of cognitive linguistics correspond to the ontological and epistemological foundations of the interpretive perspective. Moreover, he points to the need to consider language and meaning-making linguistic processes as an important area for interpretive analysis in political science and shows how CMT can contribute to this task. Finally, the paper signals possible research objectives of such analyses and the potential areas where they could be applied.

**Keywords:** interpretive approach, cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphor, discourse, interpretation

---

<sup>1</sup> This research project is supported by the “Excellence Initiative – Research University” programme, 2020-2026, for the University of Wrocław.

## INTRODUCTION – AIMS, THESES AND STRUCTURE OF THE PAPER

The basic aim of this paper is to demonstrate that the conceptual metaphor theory (CMT),<sup>2</sup> formulated within the area of cognitive linguistics, can be a useful addition to the theoretical toolbox used by political scientists who adopt the interpretive perspective. Such a notion gives rise, *implicite*, to three theses, while my attempt to verify them determines the structure of this article. The first thesis posits that cognitive linguistics can be legitimately included among theoretical instruments applied to political science. However, this only makes sense if it can be proven that language is a relevant area of reflection for interpretive analysis in political science – which is the second thesis. Provided this stands up to examination, we may consider a third thesis that states the application of CMT in the realm of political science can deliver cognitively valid, relevant results. In order to verify the above theses, I shall attempt to identify areas of overlap between interpretive political science and cognitive linguistics, including CMT, which justify the complementary use of the two perspectives in an interdisciplinary approach that calls for at least a partial integration of their respective theoretical toolboxes.<sup>3</sup>

The four categories referenced in the title (i.e., conceptual metaphor, cognitive linguistics, interpretive analysis and political discourse) carry extensive theoretical connotations which warrant a certain additional framework rigorous enough to focus further analysis and condense it into a single article.

First of all, the paper is theoretical in nature. Therefore, it does not cover any empirical case studies, nor does it provide examples of the aforementioned categories. Moreover, the article is not of a methodological character (i.e., it does not propose a specific analytical procedure). If anything, it is meta-methodological<sup>4</sup> in that it seeks to present philosophical premises underpinning the validity of any such procedure.

Secondly, being a political scientist rather than a linguist, I have made the former area my framework and a point of reference for further discussion. Although the analysis presented here aspires to be interdisciplinary in character, my purpose is not to deliver an in-depth and detailed examination of linguistic theories, but to add CMT to the theoretical foundation that enables a more comprehensive and complete insight into political processes and phenomena.

Thirdly, the reference to the concept of discourse is restricted to a declaration of the theoretical position adopted for the purpose of this article. Such a choice is dictated by the fact that this *inevitably blurry category*<sup>5</sup> has, over the years, acquired a plethora

<sup>2</sup> G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Metafory w naszym życiu*, transl. by T. Krzeszowski, Warszawa 2010.

<sup>3</sup> W. Gagarek, "O fałszywym rozumieniu interdyscyplinarności studiów europejskich," in J. Ruszkowski, L. Wojnicz (eds), *Teorie w studiach europejskich. W kierunku nowej agendy badawczej*, Szczecin–Warszawa 2012, pp. 120–123.

<sup>4</sup> M. Bevir, "Meta-Methodology: Clearing the Underbrush," in J.M. Box-Steffensmeier, H.E. Brady, D. Collier (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*, Oxford 2008, pp. 49–50.

<sup>5</sup> T.A. van Dijk, "Badania nad dyskursem," in T.A. van Dijk (ed.), *Dyskurs jako struktura i proces*, transl. by G. Grochowski, Warszawa 2001, p. 9.

of meanings driven by different philosophical traditions,<sup>6</sup> the specificity of particular academic disciplines<sup>7</sup> or the nature of regional-national academic debates and theoretical inspirations.<sup>8</sup> Accounting for all these nuances would require a nearly encyclopaedic review. As my goal here is not to focus on the category of discourse as such, but merely to create a theoretical tool for examining it, I have opted to adopt a fairly broad definition which equates discourse with the use of language (*language l/u*)<sup>9</sup> or a communicative act.<sup>10</sup> This is because Paul Chilton's view is strongly rooted in cognitive linguistics<sup>11</sup> and, just as in Teun van Dijk's definition, sees discourse as being inextricably linked with cognitive processes of individual and collective character.<sup>12</sup> In my analysis, I consider language not only (or rather, not primarily) as a communication tool, but as a means of comprehending reality – a component of human cognitive powers that provides meaning and enables us to understand our environment. It should be noted that the semasiological properties of language, which include a socio-political dimension, are visible not just at the level of discourse, but also as an inherent part of the language's structure itself, as they influence our understanding through the sheer choice of specific vocabulary and forms.<sup>13</sup> This aspect is taken into account in van Dijk's<sup>14</sup> definition which identifies three dimensions of discourse: (1) the use of language; (2) cognitive processes; (3) interactions in socio-cultural contexts. The theoretical synthesis proposed here refers to the second of the above-mentioned dimensions.

Fourthly, the goal of this article is to attempt an interdisciplinary synthesis of various theories rather than an in-depth review and critical analysis. Realising that both the interpretive approach and cognitive linguistics are multi-faceted, developing research perspectives that are continuously scrutinised, I do not seek to present them in their full complexity and richness. This does not mean I ignore, or am unaware of, the theoretical controversies associated with these approaches. The idea behind this paper compelled me to focus on those aspects that are relevant to the theses expressed

<sup>6</sup> D. Howarth, *Dyskurs*, transl. by A. Gąsior-Niemiec, Warszawa 2008, pp. 11-18.

<sup>7</sup> A. Filipczak-Białkowska, *Mechanizmy manifestowania orientacji ideologicznej w dyskursie politycznym*, Łódź 2018, p. 22.

<sup>8</sup> A. Duszak, *Tekst, dyskurs, komunikacja międzykulturowa*, Warszawa 1998, pp. 13-28; R. Wodak, "Wstęp. Badania nad dyskursem – ważne pojęcia i terminy," in R. Wodak, M. Krzyżanowski (eds), *Jakościowa analiza dyskursu w naukach społecznych*, transl. by D. Przepiórkowska, Warszawa 2011, pp. 15-22.

<sup>9</sup> P. Chilton, *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*, London–New York 2004, p. 16.

<sup>10</sup> T.A. van Dijk, "Badania...", p. 42; T.A. van Dijk, *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, London–Thousand Oaks–New Delhi 1998, p. 6.

<sup>11</sup> I. Fairclough, N. Fairclough, *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*, London–New York 2012, pp. 20-21.

<sup>12</sup> P. Chilton, *Analysing...*, pp. 50-52; T.A. van Dijk, *Ideology...*, pp. 126-129; T.A. van Dijk, "Badania...", p. 42.

<sup>13</sup> P. Chilton, C. Schäffner, "Introduction: Themes and Principles in the Analysis of Political Discourse," in P. Chilton, C. Schäffner (eds), *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia 2003, pp. 23-24.

<sup>14</sup> T.A. van Dijk, *Ideology...*, p. 6; T.A. van Dijk, "Badania...", p. 42.

in the opening paragraphs. It also dictates the structure of the following discussion. Since I declare political science as my primary framework, the analysis begins with the presentation of key tenets of the interpretive perspective, as I examine its philosophical foundations which correspond to the theoretical premises of cognitive linguistics (1) – characteristics which point to the relevance of language (2). When it comes to cognitive linguistics, I concentrate on its theoretical bases which align with the philosophical tenets behind the interpretive approach (3). With regard to CMT, I consider those elements that make it a theoretically relevant and valuable cognitive tool for political scientists (4).

## PHILOSOPHICAL TENETS OF THE INTERPRETIVE APPROACH

The interpretive paradigm represents a shift towards recognising the centrality of meaning in human life and reflecting on scientific practices associated with meaning-making.<sup>15</sup> It is defined in contrast to the model of social sciences derived from the natural sciences and positivism.<sup>16</sup> Its research objectives are described more in the spirit of the humanist *verstehen* than the natural *erklären*.<sup>17</sup> As such, the interpretive perspective is not a uniform, complete theory, but rather a broad approach that specifies certain optics when it comes to formulating research questions and the resulting preferences regarding what data is sought or how it is collected and examined. These preferences take the form of hermeneutically oriented research practices that are not necessarily accompanied by an in-depth understanding of the underlying philosophical considerations. However, articulating them here is necessary as they provide a conceptual framework that determines whether and to what extent incorporating CMT into this theoretical fold is justified.

Theoretical paradigms present in social sciences can be differentiated based on how they answer three fundamental questions: (1) the ontological one – i.e., how does a specific social reality exist?; (2) the epistemological one, which considers the relation between the object and the subject of cognition; (3) the methodological one, i.e. – how can a given reality be examined?

The interpretive perspective answers the first question from a constructivist standpoint: social reality cannot be understood in isolation as being independent and external to humans. The knowable world consists of the meanings attributed by individuals. This approach leads to a non-dual epistemology that questions the separation of

<sup>15</sup> D. Yanow, P. Schwartz-Shea, "Introduction," in D. Yanow, P. Schwartz-Shea (eds), *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, Armonk–New York–London 2003, p. xii.

<sup>16</sup> D. Yanow, "Interpretive Empirical Political Science: What Makes This not a Subfield of Qualitative Methods," *Qualitative Methods Newsletter*, vol. 2 (2003), pp. 9-11; M. Bevir, R.A.W. Rhodes, "Interpretive Political Science: Mapping the Field," in M. Bevir, R.A.W. Rhodes (eds), *Routledge Handbook of Interpretive Political Science*, London–New York 2018, pp. 4-6.

<sup>17</sup> See: W. Dilthey, *O istocie filozofii i inne pisma*, transl. by E. Paczkowska-Łagowska, Warszawa 1987.

the subject from the object of cognition. It posits that the result of cognition cannot be truly independent of the subject engaged in that cognition. In terms of methodology, this implies a preference for qualitative methods and interpretive practices oriented towards comprehension.<sup>18</sup> The non-dual epistemology and the constructivist ontology place the subject as a vital element of cognition, since it is the attributes of the subject that make the object into a perceptible phenomenon that can be understood. This theoretical approach is rooted in the rejection of the Cartesian separation of *res cogitans* from *res extensa* and in various forms of apriorism that can be traced back to Kant. In this perspective, the mind is an active structure that orders and organises cognitive stimuli, not a passive receptor that merely registers them as they are, independently of the subject.<sup>19</sup> As a result, things are not knowable in their essence but are rather the product of our conceptualisations.<sup>20</sup>

## MEANING – A CRUCIAL CATEGORY OF THE INTERPRETIVE APPROACH AND ITS CONNECTION TO LANGUAGE

The importance of language for interpretive analysis of political phenomena can be considered from two perspectives. It can be inferred from research practices and, in particular, from the methodologies used and the type of data subjected to analysis. When pointing to the hermeneutical foundations of interpretive epistemology, Dvora Yanow identifies three main types of data on which this paradigm focuses: written and spoken language, acts and interactions, as well as physical objects used in these acts of communication. All of these can be scrutinised through a diverse set of text analysis techniques that allow us to reveal and extract meanings.<sup>21</sup> However, the multiplicity of semiotic and linguistic tools used by social scientists for interpretive research does not stem solely from the kind of data that is examined. It is also because *social science is conducted in the medium of language, and that language is not a transparent 'window' on 'fact', [...] reading has become the root metaphor for many political, cultural, and social scientific activities.*<sup>22</sup> It is worth noting one detail. Interpretation, or reading text data, should not (and

<sup>18</sup> P. Corbetta, *Social Research: Theory, Methods and Techniques*, London–Thousand Oaks–New Delhi 2003, pp. 11-25; D. della Porta, M. Keating, "How Many Approaches in Social Sciences? An Epistemological Introduction," in D. della Porta, M. Keating (eds), *Approaches and Methodologies in Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*, Cambridge 2006, pp. 21-25; M. Bevir, J. Blakely, *Interpretive Social Science: An Anti-Naturalist Approach*, Oxford 2018, pp. 19-21.

<sup>19</sup> M. Bachryj-Krzywaźnia, "Filozoficzne ramy i przesłanki zróżnicowania podejścia interpretacyjno-stycznego," *Wrocławskie Studia Polilogiczne*, vol. 21 (2016), pp. 12-16.

<sup>20</sup> F. Kratochwil, "Constructivism: What it is (not) and how it Matters," in D. della Porta, M. Keating (eds), *Approaches and Methodologies in Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*, Cambridge 2006, p. 30.

<sup>21</sup> D. Yanow, "Thinking Interpretively: Philosophical Presuppositions and the Human Sciences," in D. Yanow, P. Schwartz-Shea (eds), *Interpretation and Methods: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, Armonk–London 2003, pp. 11-12.

<sup>22</sup> T. Carver, M. Hyvärinen, "Introduction," in T. Carver, M. Hyvärinen (eds), *Interpreting the Political: New Methodologies*, London–New York 2003, pp. 2-3.

certainly does not have to) be limited solely to texts that are treated as formal communication units which meet certain syntactic or structural criteria. Thus, source of data can be communication events in all the diversity of their forms.<sup>23</sup>

Nonetheless, the existing research practices do not explain where our interest in language originates or whether it is justified. The importance of language for interpretive analysis can be inferred from how a given scholar defines the purpose and meaning of research. *Interpretive approaches often begin from the insight that to understand actions, practices, and institutions, we need to grasp the beliefs – the intentional meaning – of the people involved.*<sup>24</sup> Since the interpretive approach is rooted in the hermeneutical tradition and the anti-naturalist *verstehen*, it focuses on meaning – on discerning the sense that political actors attribute to specific elements of their reality and their own references to these elements through action. The goal of interpretive analysis is to grasp the perspective of the actors (i.e., to reconstruct their subjective points of view and convictions). Beliefs and discourses provide context and make the actions taken by the participants in political life comprehensible.<sup>25</sup> If one sees beliefs as mental constructs resulting from an actor's subjective perception of reality, we might ask whether it is possible to gain genuine insight into them. Can the content and meaning of psychological constructs that constitute one's beliefs be extracted and demonstrated in another form – one that could be subjected to analytical procedures? An affirmative answer to this question comes from an extensive theoretical tradition that links language and cognition. Its beginnings can be traced back to the works of Johann Herder and Wilhelm von Humboldt. This tradition strongly influenced the American school of anthropology, the concept of linguistic relativity (the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis), the philosophies championed by authors ranging from Wittgenstein to Gadamer, as well as psycholinguistics. In this context, one could also mention Polish contributions to ethnolinguistics that developed the concepts of the 'linguistic worldview' and 'cognitive definition' (e.g., from Jerzy Bartmiński or Renata Grzegorzczkowska). Cognitive linguistics can be considered a continuation of this tradition.<sup>26</sup> If we accept that cognition occurs in the medium of language and that there is a clear link between cognition and language, it follows that each linguistic act, or every instance of thoughts being verbalised, is a materialisation of mental structures through language. Hence, all theories, methods and techniques used to analyse linguistic acts are potentially valuable for an interpretive researcher seeking to discover the meanings that constitute the context necessary to understand the behaviour of political actors. Cognitive linguistics, including CMT, is one of many available alternatives.

<sup>23</sup> A. Duszak, *Tekst...*, p. 13.

<sup>24</sup> M. Bevir, R.A.W. Rhodes, "Interpretive...", p. 12.

<sup>25</sup> M. Bevir, R.A.W. Rhodes, "Interpretations and Its Others," *Australian Journal of Political Science*, vol. 40, no. 2 (2005), pp. 170-171; M. Bevir, R.A.W. Rhodes, "Defending Interpretation," *European Political Science*, vol. 5 (2006), pp. 69-71; M. Bevir, J. Blakely, "Interpretive...", pp. 19-25.

<sup>26</sup> For the sake of precision, it needs to be pointed out the existence of other works which argue against this position (e.g., I. Kurcz, *Psychologia języka i komunikacji*, Warszawa, 2000, pp. 163-167).

## THEORETICAL TENETS OF COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS AND THEIR COMPATIBILITY WITH THE INTERPRETIVE APPROACH

To legitimise the inclusion of CMT into the theoretical bases of interpretive research practices in political science, one must address a single question: can the theoretical premises of cognitive linguistics be expressed in categories that correspond to the philosophical foundations of the interpretive approach?

The latter element was described as a combination of the constructivist ontology and the non-dual epistemology. Therefore, what remains to be done is a reconstruction of the theoretical tenets behind cognitive linguistics to see if they correspond with the philosophic premises of interpretivism. At the outset, it should be noted that cognitive linguistics is not so much a uniform theoretical perspective as a collection of compatible approaches that examine language from the standpoint of its cognitive function. Here, linguistic knowledge refers not only to the knowledge of the language itself, but also to our understanding of reality as mediated by language.<sup>27</sup> Cognitive linguistics emerged from a critical dialogue with Chomsky's theory of generative grammar, as it questioned the purpose of describing abstract rules of linguistic competence that are detached from the practical use of language and its situational context.<sup>28</sup> What Chomsky considered as peripheral issues, cognitive linguists saw as central topics – hence their calls for recontextualising language, which became the hallmark of cognitive linguistics.<sup>29</sup> In this perspective, the science of linguistics should strive to describe general principles that govern language in all its aspects while simultaneously linking these principles to the entirety of human cognitive processes, which are determined by psychological, cultural and social factors.<sup>30</sup> This approach stems from a belief that the process of cognition cannot be examined without taking into account the psychological and socio-cultural complexities characteristic of the subject of cognition. It is not a purely rational act akin to the Cartesian *res cogitans*, where the subject is an external observer separated from the object. Instead, the subject brings its complexities and contexts into the process, effectively making them inextricable circumstances in which cognition occurs. This happens through the medium of language, which is once again among several parts of a human's cognitive apparatus and uses general cognitive mechanisms, including categorisation.<sup>31</sup> When translated into the interpretive philosophy parlance,

<sup>27</sup> D. Geeraerts, H. Cuyckens, "Introducing Cognitive Linguistics," in D. Geeraerts, H. Cuyckens (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, Oxford 2007, pp. 3-7.

<sup>28</sup> E. Tabakowska, *Gramatyka i obrazowanie. Wprowadzenie do językoznawstwa kognitywnego*, Kraków 1995, pp. 12-17.

<sup>29</sup> D. Geeraerts, "Recontextualizing Grammar: Underlying Trends in Thirty Years of Cognitive Linguistics," in E. Tabakowska, M. Choiński, Ł. Wiraszka (eds), *Cognitive Linguistics in Action: From Theory to Application and Back*, Berlin–New York 2010, pp. 81-91.

<sup>30</sup> V. Evans, M. Green, *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*, Edinburgh 2006, pp. 27-41; E. Tabakowska, *Gramatyka...*, pp. 12-17.

<sup>31</sup> G. Lakoff, *Kobiety, ogień i rzeczy niebezpieczne. Co kategorie mówią nam o umyśle*, transl. by M. Buchta, A. Kotarba, A. Skucińska, Kraków 2011, p. 65.

this may be seen as a manifestation of a non-dual epistemology. A given actor's knowledge of and beliefs regarding a particular object of cognition are mediated by cognitive categories, as well as psychological and socio-cultural determinants inherent to that actor as the subject of cognition. As a result, in the words of Lakoff, *categories created by humans do not exist objectively in the world independent of any being*<sup>32</sup> – an assertion which brings us into the realm of constructivism. Our perception of reality can only be described in terms of experiential realism, and our knowledge of reality comes in the form of a construal mediated by the nature of our bodies (embodied cognition, see next section). The language in which we express that knowledge does not describe reality as it is, but rather a human construal of the world.<sup>33</sup> This is why our depiction of reality cannot be objective – it always carries a trace of the way we look at the world around us.<sup>34</sup> The terms we use to introduce order into our image of reality do not describe reality as such, but merely our image of it.<sup>35</sup> In the process of cognition, we overlay reality with categories and conceptualisations that stem from the corporal characteristics of a human being as the subject of cognition and from the socio-cultural context in which we operate. In this sense, such categories are present in the result of cognition (i.e., in the knowledge representing our image of the object of cognition as mediated by language).

## CMT AND ITS COGNITIVE POTENTIAL FOR INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS

The concept of metaphor, as commonly used, describes a stylistic measure based on an association between two terms. However, within CMT, its sense and theoretical importance extend far beyond such a basic understanding. Here, the presence of metaphors is primarily a feature of our conceptual apparatus and the way of thinking based on it. Nonetheless, metaphors are predominantly found in linguistic acts, as metaphorical linguistic expressions – a rhetorical tool that may provide insight into a person's conceptual system, thought processes and their understanding of reality.<sup>36</sup> While metaphors make up a major part of our conceptual system, they are not its sole constitutive element. We also use a fairly narrow set of non-metaphorical terms that, in a way, serve as building blocks for conceptual metaphors. Non-metaphorical terms are rooted directly in our physical experience related to the anatomy of the human body, its spatial orientation, basic physiological processes and interactions with our physical and social

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 54.

<sup>33</sup> V. Evans, M. Green, *Cognitive...*, pp. 47-48; W. Croft, D.A. Cruse, *Cognitive Linguistics*, Cambridge-New York 2004, pp. 3-4.

<sup>34</sup> E. Tabakowska, *Gramatyka...*, p. 17.

<sup>35</sup> R. Dirven, G. Radden, "Kognitywne podstawy języka: język i myśli," in E. Tabakowska (ed.), *Kognitywne podstawy języka i językoznawstwa*, Kraków 2001, pp. 32-33.

<sup>36</sup> G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Metafor...*, pp. 29-35.

environment.<sup>37</sup> Such genesis of our conceptual systems is reflected in the category of the embodied mind (embodied cognition and embodied experience),<sup>38</sup> which is one of the pillars of cognitive linguistics and an aspect of the recontextualisation of language that it postulates. One element of particular relevance to interpretive analysis is the fact that conceptual metaphors organise our thoughts as meaning-making structures. They enable political actors to make sense of the political world and frame a way of thinking about it that constructs power relations and influences intellectual and emotional responses by evaluating actors, issues and action. As components of our knowledge, they indirectly affect our actions and the way we refer to other participants and objects of social life.<sup>39</sup> In this sense, metaphors are not only specific mental representations of reality, but also have a performative function, as they orient us in the ways we interact with our reality.<sup>40</sup> The performative aspect of conceptual metaphors can be seen as the element of CMT that corresponds to the interpretive notion of how our beliefs are a constitutive element of our actions.

To answer how the meaning-making function of conceptual metaphor can be analytically useful, we need to consider the process of constructing metaphors, as well as the structure and types of metaphors. *The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another*<sup>41</sup> ... so that we conceptualise the more abstract phenomena in terms of the less abstract, more immediate ones. For instance, we describe non-physical beings or processes as if they had clear physical characteristics (an outline, size, capacity, temperature, etc.) or talk about social categories as if they shared the features of humans or other living organisms and their biological processes. In other words, constructing a metaphor entails the so-called 'mapping' of one experiential domain to another.<sup>42</sup> The properties of the source domain, which are closer to our physical experience, are transferred into the more abstract target domain. As a result, the latter assumes certain structural characteristics of the former, as the knowledge of the two domains is combined. Matching the two domains is not an accidental process; it is based on similarity stemming from the correlations in our physical experience of

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., pp. 165-167.

<sup>38</sup> V. Evans, M. Green, *Cognitive...*, pp. 44-47.

<sup>39</sup> G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Metaphory...*, p. 29; L.D. Bougher, "The Case for Metaphor in Political Reasoning and Cognition," *Political Psychology*, vol. 33, no. 1 (2012), pp. 147-150; J. Charteris-Black, *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor*, Basingstoke 2018, p. 202.

<sup>40</sup> M. Fabiszak, *A Conceptual Metaphor Approach to War Discourse and Its Implications*, Poznań 2007, p. 32; D. Yanow, "Cognition Meets Action: Metaphors as Models 'of' and Models 'for,'" in T. Carver, J. Pikalo (eds), *Political Language and Metaphor: Interpreting and Changing the World*, London-New York 2008, pp. 226-230.

<sup>41</sup> G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Metaphory...*, p. 31.

<sup>42</sup> The experiential (conceptual) domain is a fairly complex area of knowledge which refers to cohesive aspects of experience (V. Evans, *Leksykon językoznawstwa kognitywnego*, transl. by M. Buchta et al., Kraków 2009, p. 23).

the world or the embodied experience.<sup>43</sup> This is important in that the association is then made permanent at the neuronal level, thus creating a predisposition towards certain patterns of comprehending and experiencing reality – a kind of unconscious cognitive inclination.<sup>44</sup> Such an assertion is particularly noteworthy from an interpretive perspective. It follows that an actor's beliefs regarding specific objects of socio-political reality, on which that actor's actions are based, contain elements that are not inherently connected with the object of cognition, but are rather mapped from another cognitive domain. A belief about an object or an aspect of reality is, in fact, an interpretation driven by a conceptual metaphor. A psychological representation of that object or phenomenon is complemented by content and meanings from another experiential domain. The experience of such an object, mediated by the source domain, shapes the semantic field of the concept that applies to the description of that object. It can be said that constructing metaphors introduces non-literal surplus meanings into our understanding of a given concept.

Our understanding of the process of constructing conceptual metaphors allows us to assume that the properties of the source domain, which are one of the core factors behind the meaning of a given term, will, to some extent, determine the content and form of actions that an actor undertakes with regard to the object or aspect of reality described by that term. Analysing conceptual metaphors, or at least their basic structural components (i.e., domains), can provide insight into the perceptions and beliefs of a political actor. Given the performative function of metaphor, that insight may be an important starting point for understanding and anticipating actions rooted in a given metaphor. In line with Kövecses' interpretation, the performative aspect can be seen as an expression of constructivism when applied to the non-linguistic realisation of metaphors. The two conceptual domains linked through a metaphor do not exist *solely as terms or words, but also in a more tangible manner, as items or processes that we observe within our social and cultural practices*.<sup>45</sup>

## THE OBJECT AND SCOPE OF POSSIBLE ANALYSES

Lakoff and Johnson distinguish three types of metaphors: (1) orientational; (2) ontological, of which personification is a special case; (3) structural, which is a highly organised subset and provides the richest source of various possible conceptualisations of

<sup>43</sup> G. Lakoff, *Kobiety...*, pp. 384-386; Z. Kövecses, *Język, umysł i kultura. Praktyczne wprowadzenie*, transl. by A. Kowalcze-Pawlik, A. Buchta, Kraków 2011, pp. 178-179.

<sup>44</sup> G. Lakoff, *The Political Mind: A Cognitive Scientist's Guide to Your Brain and Its Politics*, New York 2009, pp. 93-110; G. Lakoff, "Neural Social Sciences," in D.D. Franks, J.H. Turner (eds), *Handbook of Neurosociology*, New York-London 2013, pp. 21-23; G. Lakoff, "Mapping the Brain's Metaphor Circuity: Metaphorical Thought in Everyday Reason," *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, vol. 8 (2014), pp. 4-5.

<sup>45</sup> Z. Kövecses, *Język...*, p. 214.

a given term.<sup>46</sup> In contrast to the first two types, structural metaphors can be described as specific-level metaphors, whereas orientational and ontological metaphors can be termed generic-level metaphors, as they are predominantly general in nature, contain little information and provide building blocks for structural metaphors.<sup>47</sup> This is why most researchers focus on the latter type as the most promising area of analysis.

Two aspects should be noted as potential subjects of scrutiny from an interpretive perspective. The first refers to the source and target domains associated with a certain term, as well as the content that the former introduces into the latter through the mapping process.<sup>48</sup> The second point relates to the selective nature of metaphorical mapping. A source domain is never fully mapped to the target domain; the process always involves highlighting some aspects while concealing others.<sup>49</sup> As Kövecses<sup>50</sup> argues, metaphors have a multilevel structure – one element of which is the frame which elaborates particular aspect of a given domain. Here, one should be mindful of the difference between conceptual metaphor and a metaphorical linguistic expression. The former category describes a cognitive structure, a manner of organising terms that orders our understanding of reality. The latter is its epiphenomenon or a linguistic manifestation. A single metaphor, based on identical source and target domains, provides a template that can generate various metaphorical linguistic expressions focusing on different aspects of the two domains.<sup>51</sup> Therefore, examining metaphors can involve identifying not only their constitutive conceptual domains, but also the frames (i.e., the particular aspects that manifest themselves in a given metaphorical expression). For those who wish to analyse conceptual metaphors – one of the cognitive structures that shape how actors perceive their realities – the two aforementioned aspects provide promising areas for analysis, since metaphorical linguistic expressions reveal the actor's beliefs.

How does it apply to political science? We have already established that the process of constructing metaphors affects our perception of reality and, consequently, how we interact with that reality through action. This claim has profound implications for political scientists, given that the object of political science, regardless of the adopted

<sup>46</sup> G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Metaphory...*, p. 99.

<sup>47</sup> Z. Kövecses, *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*, Oxford 2010, pp. 44-45.

<sup>48</sup> For a list (albeit obviously not an exhaustive one) of common source and target domains see: Z. Kövecses, *Metaphory...*, pp. 17-31.

<sup>49</sup> G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Metaphory...*, pp. 28-29.

<sup>50</sup> Z. Kövecses, "Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory: The Cognition-Context Interface," in U. Schröder, M. Mendes de Oliveira, A.M. Tenuta (eds), *Metaphorical Conceptualizations: (Inter)Cultural perspectives*, Berlin–Boston 2022, pp. 28-29.

<sup>51</sup> For instance, two different metaphorical linguistic expressions, i.e., 'we are building a state' and 'the foundations of state', are based on the same conceptual metaphor, whereby THE STATE IS A BUILDING. Source and target domains are identical, but the two expressions use different aspects (frames) within the same source domain. The first refers to the process of construction, while the second focuses on one of the construction elements.

theoretical position, may be most generally defined as a struggle for power.<sup>52</sup> This is because the concept of struggle assumes intentional, purposeful actions. These attributes of action, in turn, presuppose that the subject possesses consciousness, which consists, inter alia, of the subject's knowledge and beliefs about itself and the environment in which it functions.<sup>53</sup> Therefore, it is justified to claim the existence of structural-functional links between political action and political consciousness,<sup>54</sup> understood as a subjective reflection of political reality and constituting a precursor to political action.<sup>55</sup> Following Lakoff's thesis on the universality of metaphorical categorisation, we can conclude that in metaphorical expressions, the beliefs of political actors, which are a component of this consciousness, are manifested through the medium of language. Since their construction and functioning is crucial for the prediction of an individual's behaviour,<sup>56</sup> the perspective brought to this issue by CMT allows for an in-depth view of this relationship. For in its light, the meaning of an actor's beliefs is not only derived from the semantics of the concepts themselves, but also from the a priori content imposed on them by the properties of the source domain in which they are mapped. In other words, CMT uncovers a layer of meaning which, by virtue of the already mentioned performative function of metaphors (entailments), determines the spectrum of adequate actions of the political actor in relation to the phenomena and objects mapped metaphorically in his consciousness. CMT is, therefore, relevant for understanding and analysing one of the key elements of the conceptual repertoire of political science.

The questions that follow are: 1) What is the scientific purpose of CMT analysis in the field of political science; 2) In what way can it be relevant to the work of an interpretive political scientists?

*Linguistic metaphorical expressions signal the presence of conceptual metaphors, but can also be used to glean metaphors in one's thoughts.*<sup>57</sup> Therefore, the first and most obvious purpose of metaphor analysis is the reconstruction and description as a way to reveal meanings hidden and dispersed in textual data produced by participants in political life. Such a procedure allows us to gain insight into actors' beliefs, the content and structure of concepts they use as motivations and directions behind their positive or negative interactions with other actors, issues or processes. Thus, one potential area of application of CMT in political science is the analysis of the various forms of political

<sup>52</sup> G. Stoker, D. Marsh, "Introduction," in D. Marsh, G. Stoker (eds), *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, Basingstoke–New York, pp. 6-8.

<sup>53</sup> L. Sobkowiak, "Świadomość i socjalizacja polityczna," in A.W. Jabłoński, L. Sobkowiak (eds), *Studia z teorii polityki*, vol. 1, Wrocław 1999, pp. 155-156.

<sup>54</sup> T. Bodio, *Świadomość a zachowania polityczne*, Warszawa 1987, p. 211.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., pp. 84-85; M. Karwat, W. Milanowski, "Działania polityczne jako składnik systemu praktyki społecznej," in K. Opalek (ed.), *Elementy teorii polityki*, Warszawa 1989, pp. 110-116; L. Sobkowiak, "Działania polityczne. Teoria i praktyka," in A.W. Jabłoński, L. Sobkowiak (eds), *Marketing polityczny w teorii i praktyce*, Wrocław 2002, pp. 15-21.

<sup>56</sup> B. Wojciszke, *Teoria schematów społecznych. Struktura i funkcjonowanie jednostkowej wiedzy o otoczeniu społecznym*, Wrocław 1987, p. 7.

<sup>57</sup> Z. Kövecses, *Język...*, p. 185.

consciousness materialising in the substance of language as the content of political discourse. This includes both poorly structured, common-sense beliefs and those organised into complex worldviews, ideological, doctrinal and programmatic content.<sup>58</sup> Their analysis enables the capturing of subjective determinants that make one's actions teleologically comprehensible by revealing the cognitive pre-judgments in social arrangements and practices favoured by participants of political life and expressed as discursive manifestations. Given the performative function of conceptual metaphors, we can formulate predictive conclusions regarding actors' cognitive predispositions towards specific directions and forms of actions.

Secondly, one can engage in a critical analysis<sup>59</sup> (i.e., the examination of the ideological dimensions of a discourse understood as an arena of semantic or interpretive rivalry).<sup>60</sup> The process of social meaning-making may see some conceptualisations become commonly accepted terms that organise the popular understanding of reality. Unequal access to resources necessary to shape the content of public discourse can lead to the dominance of certain domains and frames in the conceptualisation of vital aspects of socio-political life or to the exclusion of others. This means that metaphorical conceptualisation can be treated as one of the discursive forms of legitimising some social practices as adequate, rational and morally justified or delegitimising others by portraying them as not meeting such criteria. Given the selective nature of metaphors which highlight some aspects of the target domain while hiding other,<sup>61</sup> metaphorical concepts could be used as a way to infuse seemingly neutral terms with ideological content.<sup>62</sup> The critical approach may also be extended to the research process by revealing how the metaphorical structures employed in scientific theories are ideologically entangled.<sup>63</sup>

Thirdly, analysing conceptual metaphors can aim to identify potential patterns and correlations between the way a certain aspect of reality is described through metaphors (in terms of the choice of frame and domains) and the declarative values, political objectives and visions of a desirable social, political and economic order. In other words, such an analysis may seek to identify metaphors as ideological markers by associating a certain type of metaphor with a particular worldview. This would also allow us to

<sup>58</sup> While the separation of different forms and layers of political consciousness may be justified for analytical and taxonomic reasons (see: W. Pluskiewicz, *Świadomość polityczna – analiza strukturalna*, Gliwice 1992), it should be stressed that, adopting a socio-cognitive perspective on ideology, arguably the most appropriate in the theoretical context adopted here, all these forms and layers should be understood as elements of ideology, or strict ideological content (see: T.A. van Dijk, *Ideology...*).

<sup>59</sup> E.g. J. Charteris-Black, *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*, Basingstoke–Hampshire–New York 2004; A. Musolf, "The Study of Metaphor as Part of Critical Discourse Analysis," *Critical Discourse Studies*, vol. 9, no. 3 (2012), pp. 301-310.

<sup>60</sup> W. Czachur, "Dyskursywny obraz świata. Kilka refleksji," *Tekst i Dyskurs*, vol. 4 (2011), p. 81.

<sup>61</sup> Z. Kövecses, *Język...*, p. 188; H.-G. Wolf, F. Polzenhagen, "Conceptual Metaphor as Ideological Stylistic Means: An Exemplary Analysis," in R. Dirven, F. Roslyn, M. Pütz (eds), *Cognitive Models in Language and Thought*, Berlin 2003, pp. 263-268.

<sup>62</sup> P. Chilton, *Analysing...*, pp. 48-53.

<sup>63</sup> E.g.: M.P. Marks, "Metaphors of International Cooperation," in M. Hanne, W.D. Crano, J.S. Mio (eds), *Warring with Words: Narrative and Metaphor in Politics*, New York–London 2015.

determine the ideological distance between particular participants in political life. For example, bearing in mind the continuing convergence of party platforms that researchers have observed,<sup>64</sup> the CMT perspective allows for a more nuanced analysis of programme content that goes beyond identifying postulates or statements characteristic for particular ideological orientations. This is because similar postulates on a semantic level, referring to the same values and concepts, may have a completely different ideological meaning depending on the invoked source domain, their frames and mental spaces. Analysing the continuity and change of the metaphorical mapping in the party's programmatic discourse provides an insight into the extent of the actual ideological shift in the party platform. This is due to the fact that it allows one to determine whether the shift is merely a rhetorical-marketing exercise aimed at gaining more electoral support or an expression of an actual change in the way of thinking about certain aspects of political reality.

Last but not least, it should be remembered that although language is, from the perspective adopted here, part of the human cognitive apparatus and a structure of understanding, it is also a tool for communication. Conceptual metaphors, as structures that generate and transmit meanings, can – therefore – be an interesting object of research in political communication, encompassing the diversity of this phenomenon and its research problematisation. In this area of study, the structure and cognitive functions of metaphors allow them to be considered effective framing tools, whose argumentative advantage makes them powerful instruments of persuasive influence. Conceptual metaphors constitute a kind of cognitive shortcut which, through the process of mapping between domains, facilitates the understanding and relatability of different aspects of political reality for the addressees of a persuasive message.<sup>65</sup>

## SITUATED AGENCY AND THE SOCIO-CULTURAL DIMENSION OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS

In the final segment of this paper, I feel compelled to add a certain caveat that simultaneously points to yet another area of overlap between CMT and the interpretive perspective. Interpretive research in political science considers subjective, volition- and awareness-related determinants of broadly understood political practices as a crucial independent variable that enables us to differentiate the behaviours of various actors; these factors are methodologically prioritised over objective variables such as socio-demographic characteristics. This does not mean that the interpretive approach ignores

<sup>64</sup> E.g.: R.S. Katz, P. Mair, *Democracy and the Cartelization of Political Parties*, Oxford 2018.

<sup>65</sup> L.D. Bougher, "The Case for Metaphor..."; A. Musolff, "Permacrisis, Conspiracy Stories and Metaphors," *Półrocznik Językoznawczy Tertium*, vol. 8, no. 1 (2023), pp. 5-21; A. Musolff, "The study of Metaphor..."; J. Charteris-Black, "Metaphor and Political Communication," in A. Musolff, J. Zinken (eds), *Metaphor and Discourse*, Basingstoke–New York 2009; A. Boeynaems et al., "The Effects of Metaphorical Framing on Political Persuasion: A Systematic Literature Review," *Metaphor and Symbol*, vol. 32, no. 2 (2017), pp. 118-134.

the non-subjective determinants affecting political actors or overlooks the socio-cultural influences that certainly have a discursive dimension, as they also shape the content of one's concepts and beliefs. The interpretive perspective acknowledges the validity of these aspects but, at the same time, rejects the post-structuralist notion that views the subject as an autonomous entity. This is expressed in the category of 'situated agency'.<sup>66</sup> While my discussion of cognitive linguistics and CMT has so far focused on the psychological-linguistic, individual dimension of cognitive processes and their impact on one's actions, one must also keep in mind the recontextualisation of language emphasised by this paradigm. CMT addresses this suggestion by including cultural and social factors in its analysis. It recognises that conceptual metaphors have their cultural underpinnings, while the items highlighted by these underpinnings correspond to collective experience. In this sense, culture provides context for metaphorical conceptualisation. By the same token, smaller communities within a certain culture will use the same metaphors to conceptualise their shared experiences and ideas.<sup>67</sup> Therefore, the use of CMT in an interpretive analysis in political science allows us to incorporate situated agency and, thus, reconcile the notion of actors' essential autonomy and agency with the importance of their social environment. CMT may be seen not only as a theory of meaning-making structures and processes at the level of individual experience and cognition, but also as a tool to examine the emergence of collective identity, a common discourse or shared interpretations. Here, conceptual metaphors constitute one of the building blocks for shared meanings and so contribute to the collective identity. By analysing metaphors that organise the knowledge constructed by different communities functioning within a single political entity, we can gain relevant insights into integration and disintegration processes within that entity.<sup>68</sup>

## CONCLUSION

At the beginning of this article, I presented three theses. The first referred to the possibility of integrating theories from the realms of cognitive linguistics and the interpretive approach to political science. The second thesis posited that such a synthesis was academically justified, as reflecting on the use of language promised significant cognitive benefits for scholars engaging in interpretive analyses. The final thesis postulated the relevance of CMT for interpretive analysis.

<sup>66</sup> M. Bevir, R.A.W. Rhodes, "Defending...", pp. 71-73.

<sup>67</sup> G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, *Metaphory...*, p. 107; Z. Kövecses, "Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory...", pp. 35-36; L. Cameron, "What is Metaphor and why does it Matter?," in L. Cameron, R. Maslen (eds), *Metaphor Analysis: Research in Applied Linguistics, Social Sciences and the Humanities*, London-Oakville 2010, p. 6; A. Musolff, *Political Metaphor Analysis: Discourse and Scenerios*, London-Oxford-New York-New Delhi-Sydney 2016, p. 30.

<sup>68</sup> See the concept of 'semantic fracture' in: M. Bachryj-Krzywaźnia, "W stronę despotii czy normalności? Medialne narracje wokół sporu o Trybunał Konstytucyjny," in J. Golinowski, S. Sadowski (eds), *Pomiędzy mythos i logos społecznej zmiany*, Bydgoszcz 2017.

With regard to the first thesis, I have demonstrated that the philosophical framework behind the interpretive approach corresponds to the theoretical tenets of cognitive linguistics. The constructivist ontology of the interpretive approach sees the human construal of reality and the universe of meanings – rather than the objective reality as such – as the object of cognition. Similarly, cognitive linguistics is based on the premise that our perception of reality is not objective – it is the result of cognitive processes (including linguistic processes) that occur in our minds and attempt to introduce some order into the plethora of items and phenomena we experience. The non-dual epistemology of the interpretive perspective, which questions the separation of the object and the subject of cognition, aligns with the concepts of embodied cognition and embodied experience or, in a broader sense, the call for recontextualising research on language by accounting for the socio-cultural context of its users. In this sense, both theories claim that the characteristics of the subject of cognition are somehow reflected in their knowledge of the object.

As far as the second thesis is concerned, I have shown that the interpretive paradigm focuses on the subjective meanings constructed by political actors as constitutive elements of their actions. From this standpoint, the reconstruction of these meanings is crucial as it becomes the point of reference for understanding political phenomena and processes. The examination of the use of language is important because cognitive processes, the attribution of meaning and the construction of concepts all occur in the medium of language. Therefore, language gives us insight into the content and dynamics of these processes.

Finally, in reference to the third thesis, I have argued that CMT is one of the available theoretical tools that may enable us to decode the meanings contained in textual data – the permanent record of linguistic acts. It allows us to reconstruct the context provided by the given actor's subjective meanings, which the interpretive approach sees as a vital regulator and driver of action. However, the possible research applications of CMT are not limited to precisely this purpose.

While CMT is a linguistic theory, its integration into interpretive research, which I suggest in this paper, is aimed at asking questions and formulating answers regarding a wide range of aspects of power and politics based on the analysis of textual data. My proposal is not geared towards linguistic analysis as such, but rather towards drawing conclusions about the processes occurring within the realms of politics. The interpretive paradigm highlights the importance and impact of volition- and awareness-related determinants on the actions of political actors. In this context, CMT becomes a potential tool for examining vital cognitive-linguistic premises behind political phenomena and processes. Integrating CMT into the interpretive approach may produce a variant of polito-linguistics.<sup>69</sup>

I would, however, be remiss not to mention the issue of double hermeneutics, inextricably linked with the interpretive perspective. As a tool for decoding and

---

<sup>69</sup> M. Riesigl, "Analiza retoryki politycznej," in R. Wodak, M. Krzyżanowski (eds), *Jakościowa analiza dyskursu*, Warszawa 2011, pp. 153-155.

deconstructing meanings, CMT allows us to crystallise the one element this approach deems as critical (i.e., the actor's point of view). Yet, if we acknowledge that the subject of academic cognition is not substantially different from the subjects engaged in other types of cognition,<sup>70</sup> it follows that academic cognition is affected by the same factors as 'common' cognition. In other words, political actors' knowledge about their environment is a form of interpretation. At the same time, this interpretation is reflected upon by the scholars, who are also prone to engage in interpretation when conducting their research, since they cannot truly extricate themselves from the subjective determinants of cognition.<sup>71</sup> As CMT is a tool for critical analysis that reveals the ideological undercurrents of the examined concepts, there is no reason why it could not be applied to study the terms used in various scientific theories and the conclusions drawn from them. From the vantage point provided by CMT, scholarly concepts may also, to an extent, appear as arbitrary constructs or interpretations resulting from the linking of certain conceptual domains and the emphasis on their selected aspects. Thus, dressed in the prestige of science and protected by the appearance of academic neutrality, such concepts may – not necessarily intentionally – introduce ideological bias into scholarly discourse.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bachryj-Krzywaźnia M., "W stronę despotii czy normalności? Medialne narracje wokół sporu o Trybunał Konstytucyjny," in J. Golinowski, S. Sadowski (eds), *Pomiędzy mythos i logos społecznej zmiany*, Bydgoszcz 2017.
- Bachryj-Krzywaźnia M., "Filozoficzne ramy i przesłanki zróżnicowania podejścia interpretacyjnistycznego," *Wrocławskie Studia Politolologiczne*, vol. 21 (2016), pp. 7-23, <https://doi.org/10.19195/1643-0328.21.1>.
- Bevir M., Blakely J., *Interpretive Social Science: An Anti-Naturalist Approach*, Oxford 2018, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198832942.001.0001>.
- Bevir M., "Meta-Methodology: Clearing the Underbrush," in J.M. Box-Steffensmeier, H.E. Brady, D. Collier (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*, Oxford 2008, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286546.003.0003>.
- Bevir M., Rhodes R.A.W., "Intepretation and Its Others," *Australian Journal of Political Science*, vol. 40, no. 2 (2005), pp. 169-187, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10361140500129974>.
- Bevir M., Rhodes R.A.W., "Defending Interpretation," *European Political Science*, vol. 5 (2006), pp. 69-83, <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.eps.2210059>.
- Bevir M., Rhodes R.A.W., "Interpretive Political Science: Mapping the Field," in M. Bevir, R.A.W. Rhodes (eds), *Routledge Handbook of Interpretive Political Science*, London–New York 2018.
- Bodio T., *Świadomość a zachowania polityczne*, Warszawa 1987.

<sup>70</sup> M. Czarnocka, *Podmiot poznania a nauka*, Wrocław 2003, pp. 7-8.

<sup>71</sup> M. Bachryj-Krzywaźnia, "Filozoficzne ramy i przesłanki...", pp. 18-21.

- Boeynaems A. et al., "The Effects of Metaphorical Framing on Political Persuasion: A Systematic Literature Review," *Metaphor and Symbol*, vol. 32, no. 2 (2017), pp. 118-134, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926488.2017.1297623>.
- Bougher L.D., "The Case for Metaphor in Political Reasoning and Cognition," *Political Psychology*, vol. 33, no. 1 (2012), pp. 145-163, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2011.00865.x>.
- Cameron L., "What is Metaphor and why does it Matter?," in L. Cameron, R. Maslen (eds), *Metaphor Analysis: Research in Applied Linguistics, Social Sciences and the Humanities*, London–Oakville 2010.
- Carver T., Hyvärinen M., "Introduction," in T. Carver, M. Hyvärinen (eds), *Interpreting the Political: New Methodologies*, London–New York 2003.
- Charteris-Black J., "Metaphor and Political Communication," in A. Musolff, J. Zinken (eds), *Metaphor and Discourse*, Basingstoke–New York 2009, [https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230594647\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230594647_7).
- Charteris-Black J., *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor*, Basingstoke 2018.
- Charteris-Black J., *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*, Basingstoke–Hampshire–New York 2004, <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230000612>.
- Chilton P., *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*, London–New York 2004, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203561218>.
- Chilton P., Schäffner C., "Introduction: Themes and Principles in the Analysis of Political Discourse," in P. Chilton, C. Schäffner (eds), *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia 2003.
- Corbetta P., *Social Research: Theory, Methods and Techniques*, London–Thousand Oaks–New Delhi 2003, <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849209922>.
- Croft W., Cruse D.A., *Cognitive Linguistics*, Cambridge–New York 2004, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803864>.
- Czachur W., "Dyskursywny obraz świata. Kilka refleksji," *Tekst i dyskurs*, vol. 4 (2011), pp. 79-97.
- Czarnecka M., *Podmiot poznania a nauka*, Wrocław 2003.
- van Dijk T.A., "Badania nad dyskursem," in T.A. van Dijk (ed.), *Dyskurs jako struktura i proces*, transl. by G. Grochowski, Warszawa 2001.
- van Dijk T.A., *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, London–Thousand Oaks–New Delhi 1998.
- Dilthey W., *O istocie filozofii i inne pisma*, transl. by E. Paczkowska-Łagowska, Warszawa 1987.
- Dirven R., Radden G., "Kognitywne podstawy języka: język i myśl," in E. Tabakowska (ed.), *Kognitywne podstawy języka i językoznawstwa*, Kraków 2001.
- Duszak A., *Tekst, dyskurs, komunikacja międzykulturowa*, Warszawa 1998.
- Evans V., Green M., *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*, Edinburgh 2006.
- Evans V., *Leksykon językoznawstwa kognitywnego*, transl. by M. Buchta et al., Kraków 2009.
- Fabiszak M., *A Conceptual Metaphor Approach to War Discourse and Its Implications*, Poznań 2007.
- Fairclough I., Fairclough N., *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*, London–New York 2012, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203137888>.

- Filipczak-Bilkowska A., *Mechanizmy manifestowania orientacji ideologicznej w dyskursie politycznym*, Łódź 2018, <https://doi.org/10.18778/8142-136-2.01>.
- Gagatek W., "O fałszywym rozumieniu interdyscyplinarności studiów europejskich," in J. Ruszkowski, L. Wojnicz (eds), *Teorie w studiach europejskich. W kierunku nowej agendy badawczej*, Szczecin–Warszawa 2012.
- Geeraerts D., Cuyckens H., "Introducing Cognitive Linguistic," in D. Geeraerts, H. Cuyckens (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, Oxford 2007.
- Geeraerts D., "Recontextualizing Grammar: Underlying Trends in Thirty Years of Cognitive Linguistics," in E. Tabakowska, M. Choiński, E. Wiraszka (eds), *Cognitive Linguistics in Action: From Theory to Application and Back*, Berlin–New York 2010, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110226096.1.71>.
- Goatly A., *Washing the Brain – Metaphor and Hidden Ideology*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia 2007, <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.23>.
- Howarth D., *Dyskurs*, transl. by A. Gąsior-Niemiec, Warszawa 2008.
- Karwat M., Milanowski W., "Działania polityczne jako składnik systemu praktyki społecznej," in K. Opałek (ed.), *Elementy teorii polityki*, Warszawa 1989.
- Katz R.S., Mair P., *Democracy and the Cartelization of Political Parties*, Oxford 2018, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199586011.001.0001>.
- Kövecses Z., "Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory: The Cognition-Context Interface," in U. Schröder, M. Mendes de Oliveira, A.M. Tenuta (eds), *Metaphorical Conceptualizations: (Inter)Cultural Perspectives*, Berlin–Boston 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110688306-002>.
- Kövecses Z., *Język, umysł i kultura. Praktyczne wprowadzenie*, transl. by A. Kowalcze-Pawlik, A. Buchta, Kraków 2011.
- Kövecses Z., *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*, Oxford 2010.
- Kratochwil F., "Constructivism: What it is (not) and how it Matters," in D. della Porta, M. Keating (eds), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*, Cambridge 2006, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801938.006>.
- Kurcz I., *Psychologia języka i komunikacji*, Warszawa 2000.
- Lakoff G., Johnson M., *Metafory w naszym życiu*, transl. by T. Krzeszowski, Warszawa 2010.
- Lakoff G., *Kobiety, ogień i rzeczy niebezpieczne. Co kategorie mówią nam o umyśle*, transl. by M. Buchta, A. Kotarba, A. Skucińska, Kraków 2011.
- Lakoff G., "Mapping the Brain's Metaphor Circuitry: Metaphorical Thought in Everyday Reason," *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, vol. 8 (2014), pp. 1-14, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00958>.
- Lakoff G., "Neural Social Sciences," in D.D. Franks, J.H. Turner (eds), *Handbook of Neurosociology*, New York–London 2013.
- Lakoff G., *The Political Mind: A Cognitive Scientist's Guide to Your Brain and Its Politics*, New York 2009.
- Marks M.P., "Metaphors of International Cooperation," in M. Hanne, W.D. Crano, J.S. Mio (eds), *Warring with words: Narrative and Metaphor in Politics*, New York–London 2015.
- Musolf A., "Permacrisis, Conspiracy Stories and Metaphors," *Półrocznik Językoznawczy Tertium*, vol. 8, no. 1 (2023), pp. 5-21, <https://doi.org/10.7592/Tertium.2023.8.1.246>.

- Musolff A., "The Study of Metaphor as Part of Critical Discourse Analysis," *Critical Discourse Studies*, vol. 9, no. 3 (2012), pp. 301-310, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2012.688300>.
- Musolff A., *Political Metaphor Analysis: Discourse and Scenarios*, London–Oxford–New York–New Delhi–Sydney 2016.
- Pluskiewicz W., *Świadomość polityczna – analiza strukturalna*, Gliwice 1992.
- della Porta D., Keating M., "How Many Approaches in the Social Sciences? An Epistemological Introduction," in D. della Porta, M. Keating (eds), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective*, Cambridge 2006.
- Riesigl M., "Analiza retoryki politycznej," in R. Wodak, M. Krzyżanowski (eds), *Jakościowa analiza dyskursu*, Warszawa 2011.
- Sobkowiak L., "Działania polityczne. Teoria i praktyka," in A.W. Jabłoński, L. Sobkowiak (eds), *Marketing polityczny w teorii i praktyce*, Wrocław 2002.
- Sobkowiak L., "Świadomość i socjalizacja polityczna," in A.W. Jabłoński, L. Sobkowiak (eds), *Studia z teorii polityki*, vol. 1, Wrocław 1999.
- Stoker G., Marsh D., "Introduction," in D. Marsh, G. Stoker (eds), *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, Basingstoke–New York 2002.
- Tabakowska E., *Gramatyka i obrazowanie. Wprowadzenie do językoznawstwa kognitywnego*, Kraków 1995.
- Wodak R., "Wstęp. Badania nad dyskursem – ważne pojęcia i terminy," in R. Wodak, M. Krzyżanowski (eds), *Jakościowa analiza dyskursu w naukach społecznych*, transl. by D. Przepiórkowska, Warszawa 2011.
- Wojciszke B., *Teoria schematów społecznych. Struktura i funkcjonowanie jednostkowej wiedzy o otoczeniu społecznym*, Wrocław 1987.
- Wolf H.-G., Polzenhagen F., "Conceptual Metaphor as Ideological Stylistic Means: An Exemplary Analysis," in R. Dirven, F. Roslyn, M. Pütz (eds), *Cognitive Models in Language and Thought*, Berlin 2003, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110892901.247>.
- Yanow D., "Cognition Meets Action: Metaphors as Models 'of' and Models 'for,'" in T. Carver, J. Pikalo (eds), *Political Language and Metaphor: Interpreting and Changing the World*, London–New York 2008.
- Yanow D., "Interpretive Empirical Political Science: What Makes This not a Subfield of Qualitative Methods," *Qualitative Methods Newsletter*, vol. 2 (2003), pp. 9-13.
- Yanow D., Schwartz-Shea P., "Introduction," in D. Yanow, P. Schwartz-Shea (eds), *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, Armonk–London 2003.
- Yanow D., "Thinking Interpretively: Philosophical Presuppositions and the Human Sciences," in D. Yanow, P. Schwartz-Shea (eds), *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, Armonk–London 2003.

---

**Maciej BACHRYJ** – from the beginning of his scientific career, his research has focused on various aspects (philosophical, psychological, linguistic) of understanding and interpretation in political science and its methodological implications. Drawing on the belief that the human factor is the primary and basic substratum of the political, he uses theoretical tools adopted from other disciplines to explore the cognitive mechanisms behind political processes and phenomena, as well as individual and collective behaviour.