



Good Intentions Exploited Badly: Contested Metaphors of Russian Patriotism

Inna Skrynnikova, Tatiana Permyakova & Ekaterina Pozdeeva

To cite this article: Inna Skrynnikova, Tatiana Permyakova & Ekaterina Pozdeeva (2021): Good Intentions Exploited Badly: Contested Metaphors of Russian Patriotism, Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, DOI: [10.1080/17475759.2021.1963307](https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2021.1963307)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2021.1963307>



Published online: 26 Aug 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Good Intentions Exploited Badly: Contested Metaphors of Russian Patriotism

Inna Skrynnikova ^a, Tatiana Permyakova ^b and Ekaterina Pozdeeva ^b

^aDepartment of German and Romance Philology, Volgograd State University, Volgograd, Russia;

^bDepartment of Foreign Languages, HSE University, Perm, Russia

ABSTRACT

Generating and cultivating patriotic sentiments has been universally recognized as being critical for any nation. The originally sacralized Russian patriotism has evolved into an ambiguous concept due to its discrediting in the post-Soviet era. The paper claims that patriotism is an essentially contested concept, frequently employed as a promotional tool in political campaigns, with figurative language serving as a tool for articulating patriotic sentiments. By applying corpus-based methods, the study elicits dominant metaphors employed in the discursive construction of Russian patriotism. It reveals variation, found in a set of preferred metaphors, which reflects diverging metaphorical narratives in the current patriotic discourse. The paper argues that metaphors are effective explanatory and framing tools applied in constructing the Russian national identity.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 10 January 2021

Accepted 28 July 2021

KEYWORDS

Patriotism; national identity; contested concepts; metaphor; corpus; cross-domain mappings; preferential conceptualization

Introduction

Defining meaning and living space of many peoples, the idea of being a patriot seems ostensibly universal across cultures, when viewed etymologically (the Greek words, *patris* – “homeland, fatherland”, *patriots* – “countryman, compatriot”). It implies affection and love for everything fatherly (native land, language, tradition), as well as a willingness to volunteer and protect fatherland. The avowed purpose of patriotism, which manifests itself in a myriad of forms, symbols and slogans, is to maintain national cohesion. Being traditionally and pervasively understood as affection for, and a feeling of belonging to, one’s country, it has evolved to become a strikingly ambiguous concept. The ways of understanding patriotism as well as the resulting social practices vary across nations, which brings far-reaching implications, both for individuals’ relationships within communities they live in and their relations with other (foreign) communities.

The question arises, how are patriotic feelings generated and articulated across nations? Some claim they are nothing but “specific reactions to stimuli coming from the physical environment, the cultural ambience one lives in, and the people one lives with” (Doob, 1964; Evans & Kelley, 2002; Kecmanovic, 1996). Others suggest that patriotism’s multidimensional nature results in its diverse interpretations across different contexts (Ariely, 2017). But what exactly makes people particularly proud of their nation?

Previous research suggests that national pride can take two forms, generally referred to as patriotism and nationalism (Adorno et al., 2019; Brubaker, 2004; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; Schatz et al., 2003). The former is normally associated with “positive identification and feelings of affective attachment to one’s country” (Schatz et al., 2003), and can be expressed through pride in national achievements without being judgemental about other nations. Yet, it does not necessarily mean that patriotic people cannot be reasonably critical of their own nation if it does not meet people’s expectations and demands to a certain degree (Adorno et al., 2019; Federico et al., 2005; Schatz et al., 2003).

A critical societal role of raising patriotic feelings is hardly disputable as they contribute to enhancing cooperation between the nation’s members (Tajfel, 1974; Terry et al., 1999) and triggering prosocial behaviour (Bar-Tal, 1993; Raagmaa, 2002). It has been repeatedly attested that sound patriotism results in tax compliance, election participation, or blood donation (Gangl et al., 2016; Huddy & Khatib, 2007; Wenzel, 2002). Therefore, the presence of patriotism in any nation’s citizens is beneficial to a state which boosts trust in its authorities (Gangl et al., 2016; Kirchler et al., 2008; Konrad & Qari, 2012; Whitley, 1999). Not surprisingly, public authorities and institutions have successively demonstrated their efforts to exploit the concept of patriotism as a promotional tool in their campaigns. However, such endeavours of manipulating patriotism involve certain risks as the resulting effects cannot be predicted and strongly depend on the type of the presented patriotic material. Moreover, if selected inappropriately, it may lead to side effects and translate into destructive nationalism (Gangl et al., 2016).

Language, being central to clearly articulating national ideologies, serves as a crucial element in the definition of people’s identities. The critical role of figurative language and metaphor, in addressing a wide range of socio-political issues, has been repeatedly attested. The studies of metaphors and metaphorical models for discussing political issues range from combating corruption (Budaev & Chudinov, 2008), the immigration crisis (Bresnahan et al., 2018; Heuman & González, 2018; Quinsaas, 2014) to EU policies (Musolff, 2004), financial issues (Charteris-Black & Musolff, 2003), and multimodal representations of patriotism (Merskin, 2007; Skrynnikova & Permyakova, 2019). Moreover, most political frames are metaphorical in nature, but the metaphorical models used to describe political and social issues are dynamic and volatile, affected by a change in vision and approaches to solving important problems. For example, journalists most frequently resort to using the game frame, and report political events using sports or war metaphors. This implies the conceptualization of politicians either as athletes in the game (match) or as military commanders employed on the battlefield.

Using figurative language to frame political events makes politics more engaging, appealing to the feelings of the people, and more understandable for the target audience. But one of the most important functions of a metaphor in social and political discourse, undoubtedly, remains its ability to facilitate the adoption by the recipient of a certain (desired) position on specific issues (Honohan, 2008). The study of metaphors in political communication strategies relies on critical metaphor analysis (CMA) as a form of critical discourse analysis (CDA), which has been applied in the present paper (Maalej, 2007). CDA deals with covert as well as transparent structural interrelation of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language (Wodak, 2001). It reveals the ways in which language and discourse become an integral part of an ideology, inherent from history and culture. CMA, proposed by Charteris-Black (2004),

incorporates CDA as well as pragmatics and the cognitive approach developed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Such a comprehensive approach enables us to address the cognitive, the ideological as well as the historical attributes of metaphors (Cammaerts, 2012). It includes the following levels:

- (1) Descriptive level: identification and recognition, frames being addressed;
- (2) Interpretative level: mapping out correspondences between frames;
- (3) Motivational level: identifying political intentions.

In terms of CMA, this paper deals with the descriptive and interpretative levels of analysis.

The current paper examines metaphoric representation of patriotism in Russia, applying G. Lakoff's conceptual metaphor theory, critical metaphor analysis (Charteris-Black, 2004) and preferential conceptualization analysis (Kövecses, 2005). The paper aims to address the following questions:

- (1) What are the major metaphors employed in the discursive construction of Russian patriotism?
- (2) Is there a certain variation in preferred metaphors?
- (3) What is the role of these metaphors in creating a concept of patriotism?

The findings and possible answers to these questions may provide deeper insights into understanding the role of metaphor in constructing the national identity of a patriotic Russian as well as substantiate the potential of metaphor as a powerful framing tool.

The Nature of Russian Patriotism

The Russian idea of patriotism, reflected in the spiritual experience of the Russian people, has been an ontologically significant component of their national identity and self-fulfilment. Patriotism of a special kind, which dominates the public discourse of sovereignty, has formed and fostered the public discussion of pressing societal issues. Ideas and meanings "crystallized" in the basic concepts of patriotism are believed to be of critical importance for the preservation of the spiritual and cultural foundations of nations inhabiting Russia. Patriotism, promulgated by President V. Putin as the only ideology in modern Russia, is treated as a commonly accepted public system of beliefs and ideas, where the discourse of patriotism is largely represented in the context of not conformist, but rather personal, experiential affection for the country. This echoes the view of the discourse analysis theorist Van Dijk, 2013, who notes that such mental contextual models "... are subjective, they determine the situation and may be incomplete, biased, based on prejudices, that is, strikingly different from what is referred to as the "objective situation" (p. 288). They are dynamically constructed and changed in the course of communication.

On the one hand, the idea of unconditional patriotism, originating from archaic narratives (oral legends and written folklore sources) and maintaining spiritual and moral self-awareness, has permeated the Russian national identity. On the other hand, it is the very patriotism which has undergone significant discrediting, as a result of the

chaos spurred by the political and socio-economic transformation of the Russian society in the post-Soviet era.

Under the circumstances, patriotism, in our view, can be treated as an essentially contested concept. Taking into account the critical role of language which serves as a discursive pragmatic mechanism to foreground a particular view of patriotism and the interpretative and explanatory potential of figurative language, in making sense about abstract concepts, the paper argues that metaphor is a powerful conduit for patriotism, enabling the (re)framing of it in a certain way, both in public discourse and mediated communication.

Lexicographic sources provide some evidence in favour of the growing ambiguity of treating Russian patriotism. While the 2011 Academic dictionary of the Russian language (Gerd, 2011) provides a total of 8 entries (nouns, adverbs and adjectives derived from “*patriot*”), the common lexis of modern mass communication is replete with several dozen new derivatives, ranging from neologisms to vulgarisms and derogatives (e.g. state patriot, quasi-patriot, Jewish patriot, gay patriot, patrocad, etc.). The post-perestroika online media in Russia introduced “Orthodox patriotism”, “liberal patriotism”, “supra-ethnic patriotism”, “enlightened patriotism”, “left patriotism”, “shaven-headed patriotism”, “Putin’s abstract patriotism”, “paid patriotism”, “ostentatious patriotism”, “commodity patriotism”, “fashionable patriotism” and “leavened patriotism”. It suggests that, in the minds of different people, even those speaking the same language, these derived words reflect different subjective ideas and narratives, which are structured by the concepts of “patriot” and “patriotism”. The question arises why exactly these concepts, unlike other dominants of Russian socially significant codes under socio-economic transformation, have become strikingly salient?

Literature Review

Previous research is ripe with various approaches to metaphors in evoking patriotic sentiments, which range from discourse analysis, conceptual metaphor theory (CMT), cognitive psychology, framing theory to corpus, gender, cultural and communication studies, some of which are not mutually exclusive.

Numerous studies have provided sufficient evidence that figurative language in general, and metaphors in particular, are strikingly effective in articulating ideologies and arousing emotions (Kitis & Milapides, 1997), when being interpreted through shared cultural knowledge. The extent to which people from different cultural backgrounds share cultural knowledge and ideologies is subject to certain variation (Charteris-Black, 2003; Deignan, 2003; Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1994; Littlemore, 2003).

The powerful potential of metaphors in the discursive construction of patriotism in Great Britain (Musolff, 2004), the USA (Smith, 2002), Russia (Skrynnikova & Astafurova, 2020), Hong Kong (Flowerdew & Leong, 2007), and China (Yu, 2003), has been repeatedly addressed in numerous studies. The latter argues that abstract concepts are understood in part via a conceptual metaphor grounded in the body. However, they are also shaped by a culture-specific metaphorical understanding of internal organs inside the body. With the human body being a potentially universal source domain for metaphors, structuring abstract concepts such as patriotism, courage, etc., cultural models prompt

specific perspectives, from which certain aspects of bodily experience are viewed as especially salient and meaningful in the understanding of those abstract concepts.

Semino and Koller (2009), consider the rhetorical functions and ideological implications of metaphor use by combining the main tenets of conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Kövecses, 2002), with a social constructivist view of gender (Sunderland, 2004), to the corpus of speeches and interviews by two Italian politicians, Silvio Berlusconi and Emma Bonino. The study is aimed at explaining the differences and similarities in the metaphoric choices, made by a male and female politician, in terms of a range of sources of variation, including political orientation, topics, concerns, goals and audiences (see also Kövecses, 2005). These factors become helpful in interpreting the ways in which each individual politician performs femininity and masculinity in their public discourse.

Treating discursive metaphor as a type of extended metaphor in public discourse, Musolff (2006), introduces the concept of “metaphor scenarios” that “carry evaluative and attitudinal biases that are related to particular political dispositions and preferences of the respective national discourse communities”. Given the multimodal nature of metaphor (Forceville, 2016), its explanatory power in making sense about what patriotism is, in a particular nation or context, increases manifold. Cross-cultural analysis of multimodal metaphors is aimed at identifying both universal conceptual models of patriotism, as well as culture-specific ones, found at the level of metaphorical mappings and entailments. Cross-cultural variation in metaphorical conceptualizations is seen not as a matter of divergent discourse strategies but as differences in the conceptual understanding of national identity and patriotism across cultures (Lantolf & Bobrova, 2014).

However, it is worth mentioning that opting for a particular metaphor is not always unconscious, as politicians and public figures may employ certain metaphors deliberately, to foreground something to their own advantage. The deliberate choice of a particular metaphor makes a difference, as exemplified by George W. Bush’s war on terrorism, in response to the events of September 11, 2001, which is substantially metaphoric as well as more recent “wars on poverty”, “wars on drugs and cancer”, and more recently “battles and fights against coronavirus”. When it comes to evoking patriotic feelings, resorting to the war metaphor, as some argue, seems to facilitate “mobilization” of effort, while entailing less desirable consequences (Smith, 2002).

With the growing number of national minority groups calling for their recognition on the basis of a putative discrete ethnicity, the metaphor repertoire, found in the course of discursive construction of their national identity and patriotism in mass media, is becoming more varied. This leads some researchers to conclude that an emphasis on the use of conceptual metaphors, in the context of ethnicity discourses, provides “a valuable insight into ethnic self-understanding at a given point in time, and that, consequently, this approach is a valuable addition to the analytic repertoire for researchers concerned with issues of emergent ethnicity and the construction of ethnic identities in general” (Wilson & Hay, 2013).

Data and Methodology

Despite considerable progress in elaborating the corpus-based metaphor analysis methods, Conceptual Metaphor Theory still lacks a reliable systematic methodology applied to

the study of metaphor, especially when it comes to naturally-occurring corpus data. The reason for this lies in identifying and extracting the relevant data from the corpus (Stefanowitsch, 2006). Methodologically, the present research procedure comprises several steps, consistent with the research objectives. The initial stage of the study involves the analysis of “patriot(-ism)” collocations, as represented in the newspaper subcorpus of the Russian National Corpus (RNC). RNC is an online electronic resource of modern Russian texts, incorporating over 600 million words and reflecting word uses across various genres, both written and oral.

The RNC newspaper subcorpus comprises statistically valid representation of the Russian print and electronic media of nationwide circulation, such as *Argumenty i fakty*, the most popular Russian weekly newspaper, with a print run of over one million; *Izvestia*, a Russian daily broadsheet newspaper, featuring national and international news on a wide variety of fields; *Komsomol'skaya Pravda*, a Russian national newspaper covering a wide variety of topics, from business and economy to culture and sport; *Vedomosti*, a Russian daily business newspaper; *Lenta*, one of the most popular Russian online newspapers; and the three leading Russian news agencies – ITAR-TASS, Interfax and RIA.

To reveal the set of metaphors found in political, mass media and popular discourse, a subcorpus of 1,248 entries (articles), covering the period from 2000 till the present, was compiled and analysed to account for current metaphorical conceptualizations of patriotism and national pride in Russia. These years cover such events as celebrating the anniversaries of the Victory in the Great Patriotic War, accompanied by an increased number of publicly funded patriotisation initiatives, holding the 2014 Olympic Games in Sochi and the 2018 Football World Cup, the Ukrainian crisis and the subsequent accession of the Crimea, hostilities in Syria, building up the military facilities, economic sanctions imposed by the West, etc. The articles, which include political speeches, news reports, and interviews, reflect various views of what makes a patriotic Russian, as seen by representatives of various political, age and professional groups.

The next step is to generate concordances for each of the collocations and to manually analyse the surrounding co-text to determine metaphorical uses, for example, *tanned patriotism*, *sound patriotism*, *fat patriotism*. The source domain was listed for each reference, for example, words such as *tanned*, *sound*, *fat*, etc. were listed under the BODY domain (compare: *tanned body*, *sound body*, *fat body*). In case the reference domain was disputable, double independent experts' evaluation from the code list was applied, to ensure the correctness of the entry. Independent experts also referred to the meanings provided in Ozhegov and Shvedova (1994),

for example, *tanned skin*: “skin is an external tissue of a human or animal **body**”. Subsequently, a list of the metaphorical expressions falling under each source domain was produced.

The procedure of identifying conceptual metaphors (cross-domain mappings between a source and a target domain) in a corpus, involves dealing with certain challenges, since conceptual mappings are not restricted to a specific set of linguistic forms but, rather, to different sets. The search for topic/ target domain vocabulary helps to reveal the nature of the conceptual mapping it belongs to. Revealing the metaphorical mappings involves identifying those occurrences of the topic/target domain which indicate a metaphorical status.

The final step of the research relies on the preferential conceptualizations models analysis, as proposed by Kövecses (2005), applied to reveal the competing conceptualizations of patriotism and related concepts. It means we quantitatively compare the scope of source, as a gradient between preferential conceptualizations becomes a critical question for the current research.

Findings

The preliminary findings of the study show that the patriotic discourse in Russian is predominantly metaphorical, presenting a myriad of conceptualization patterns which reflect the competing or divergent metaphorical narratives.

The first research question of this study presupposes identifying the most pervasive metaphors employed in the discursive construction of Russian patriotism. To this end, we first examined the year-by-year distribution (2000–2014) of “patriotism” in RNC (see Table 1. below) and defined the scope of source domains based on the collocation patterns analysis. This enabled us to reveal a repertoire of metaphors in the Russian patriotic discourse, employed by politicians and mass media. Since the corpus entry procedures with verification and normalization take two years on average, the search data ended with 2014.

The total subcorpus comprised 433,373 documents, i.e. statistically representative extracts of the national language in media, of 228,521,421 words. The keyword “patriot(-ism)” and its derivatives were found in 1,248 entries, contained in 922 documents. Eliciting the dominant metaphorical models of patriotism assumes not only defining the prevalent source domains but also analysing their frequency, which reflects the systematic patterns of conceptualizing patriotism. Thus, the identified number of metaphors in the sample is 674 among 1,248 corpus entries in the sample, which makes the Metaphor-to-Corpus-Entry Ratio 0.54. It means that slightly over half of all “patriot(-ism)” entries in the corpus are used metaphorically.

Table 2 illustrates the scope of source domains for patriotism, their frequency in the subcorpus as well as examples of collocations in Russian with their translation.

As is seen from the table above, the most frequent conceptualization pattern in the subcorpus is *PATRIOTISM is SPORTS/GAME or GAMBLING* (26%).

- (1) Young people there also talk about the need to fight for their homeland, but these are, rather, slogans, rhetorical moves, behind which there is no real willingness. Does it mean the state mistakenly bets on military patriotism? (Lenta. August 152014)
- (2) Considering that both the card of anti-Americanism and the card of patriotism are being played, the majority of the population will be delighted, says political

Table 1. Distribution of the term “patriot(-ism)” in the newspaper subcorpus of RNC (2000–2014).

2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
69	107	87	78	79	43	67	122
2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	
97	167	80	77	85	51	39	

Table 2. The scope of source domains for the metaphor.

PATRIOTISM/ BEING PATRIOTIC is	(%) N = 674	Items
SPORTS/GAME or GAMBLING	26,1	To score, a (gamble) chip, to bet, to sort out cards, patriotic games
GARDENING/BREEDING	15,2	To graft patriotism, to grow and breed patriots, to sow patriotic feelings, to grow in one's soul
BEING (IM)MORAL	12,5	Police-style, vulgar, sincere, naïve, aggressive
MARKET COMMODITY/ BUSINESS	10,3	Demand for, monopoly on, patriotic business, spending on patriotism
BUILDING	9,2	Foundation, shelter, pillar
SPACE	9,1	To spread, to decline
HUMAN BODY	7,3	Tanned, full (stomach)
FORCE/PRESSURE	6,1	To crush, to force
FOOD	4,2	Feed with patriotism, be fed up with patriotism

analyst, Vyacheslav Igrunov, the authorities are playing a win-win game on the internal stage. (Vedomosti. December 122014)

The definition of “to bet – to stake money in a game and this money is lost in case of a negative outcome” (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994). In example (1), the meaning behind the metaphor implied is that patriotism, brought about by the government, relying on the military affairs, is *a risky activity*, as the actors may lose. In example (2), the political analyst of one of the think-tanks refers to patriotism as playing cards (= ‘a gambling game that causes *the feeling of excitement*’ (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994), which stresses out only the positive effect of gambling for a Russian reader. Additionally, the contextual implication is that patriotism may be viewed differently, with regard to internal or external policy (anti-Americanism), and is seen as most effective when the two policies are aligned. All in all, patriotism in SPORT/GAME or GAMBLING source domains is viewed as exciting from the coordinated political perspective and risky from the military perspective.

The second most frequent conceptualization pattern is **INSTILLING PATRIOTISM is GARDENING/BREEDING** (15,2%)

- (1) It should be noted that this bill is not the first attempt by the authorities to sow patriotism and citizenship among the masses. In particular, the Ministry of Education and Science suggested fostering love for the motherland, in school-children, by touring Russia, local history lessons and excursions. (Interfax. November 8 2013).
- (2) What fields do true patriots grow in? It is not that Russians do not want to become patriots – they are jarred by the official falsehood . . . And it (patriotism) historically sprouted on the Orthodox grounds. (Arumenty i fakty. January 5 2013).

In example (3), patriotism is referred to as something that can be sowed. While “to sow” is defined as “to put seed into the ground, so that plants will grow” (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994), its second definition is “to gradually instil the idea into someone’s mind” (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994). Hence, the metaphor suggests that the younger generation is seen only as a medium which should passively accept the idea of patriotism, regardless of their willingness or conscious effort to do so. In example (4), while “to grow” and “to

sprout” suggest no negative connotations by themselves, meaning “to develop to a more advanced stage” (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994) and “to begin to grow” (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994), respectively, the adjective “jarred” indicates that Russians do not trust the official approach to instilling the feeling of patriotism. The examples suggest that the younger generation today does not need any direct agitation, which can hardly have any positive effects in the future. Patriotism is an existential feeling that cannot be brought up with the help of a special programme. The attempts to instil patriotic feelings, when approached formally and bureaucratically, not meaningfully, may be disapproved by members of the society. This means that the recent government initiatives (funding patriotic camps, demonstrating Russian military might, etc.) to boost patriotism among the young generation, may have the reverse effect.

The third most frequent conceptualization pattern is **IMPOSING PATRIOTISM is BEING (IM)MORAL** (12,5%).

(5) It is sad that Ukraine has become a hostage to Kolomoisky’s inner complexes. It is he, rather than radical nationalists, Right sector or Svoboda, who poses the major threat to the Ukrainian nationhood and citizens’ peaceful life. If Kolomoisky stops backing them financially, their aggressive patriotism will fizzle out. Kolomoisky has children; he has earned a billion, bought a football club, built a stadium; he keeps a pack of politicians on a leash, Yet, the satisfaction with life, as well as enthusiasm about work are missing. So, he decides to have his own army – as he needs to have his whack of playing commander, military planner and conqueror (Izvestiya. January 6 2014).

In example (5), since patriotism is referred to as being “aggressive”, i.e. “being violent or using force to achieve success”, the metaphor suggests that the idea of patriotism is imposed on citizens, regardless of their own willingness to accept it. Also, Ukraine is said to have become a “hostage” to I.V. Kolomoisky, a Ukrainian politician and billionaire. Since “hostage” is “a person taken as prisoner by an enemy in order to force other people to do what the enemy wants them to do” (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994), this metaphor suggests that I.V. Kolomoisky, who allegedly finances radical Ukrainian nationalists, manipulates the idea of patriotism, pursuing his own interests. Another metaphor (“he keeps a pack of politicians on a leash”) implies that he acts as a grey eminence, controlling some politicians and influencing political decisions since “a leash” is “a piece of rope or chain that dogs’ owners tie to dogs’ collars to take them for a walk” (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994). The examples suggest that patriotism is viewed as a means of manipulation by corrupt politicians who seek more power.

The **PATRIOTISM is COMMODITY/BUSINESS** conceptualization pattern is used less frequently than the previous one (10,3%).

(6) It happens everywhere. Even in Ukraine, both in 2004 and 2014 - the “rogue government” is accused of antipatriotic actions and the sell-out of citizens’ interests. Russia today is a striking exception. Only today, our critics and authorities unanimously granted it monopoly privileges on patriotism and do not even make attempts to withdraw them. (7) Instead, they claim that “any patriot should like authority. Those who do not like authority are not patriots. Me - I am not a patriot”. This paradox can be easily explained. Modern “antipatriots” set themselves at odds with their Motherland itself rather than with the political regime or the state (Izvestiya. February 6 2014).

Monopoly is defined as “an exclusive right to produce or sell something, also an exclusive use of something, e.g. state (government) monopoly for international trade;

a major concentration of production and capital in an industry, in order to dominate in it and maximize profit; priority right compared to the others” (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994). Example (6) suggests that only the government has an exclusive right to declare what patriotism is and uses this power. This official (bureaucratic) patriotism is seen as the Russian national idea or the so-called cultural code, while the alternative view of taking pride in merely being Russian faces criticism. In general, one of the specific features of the Russian idea of patriotism lies in viewing patriotism as a commercial activity, bringing to mind the resulting inferences of a market with its participants, the inherent competition, etc. Another point worth mentioning is to understand patriotism, not in terms of affection for the country but in terms of unconditional acceptance and respect for those in power. Otherwise, one can be treated as an antipatriotic traitor. Interestingly, in example (7) the very narrative coins the contested nature of patriotism through the abstract term, “paradox” (= opinion or utterance that contradicts, at least initially, common sense) (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994).

The fifth conceptualization pattern in the subcorpus is **PATRIOTISM is BUILDING/FOUNDATION** (9,2%).

- (1) We must build our future on a solid foundation. And patriotism is such a foundation. No matter how long we have been discussing what can be the foundation, a solid moral foundation for our country, we will not think of anything else. (Putin. Kremlin. September 122012).
- (2) “Patriotism – is the last refuge of a scoundrel”. The saying means that even the most dishonest and unscrupulous person can feel the attachment to his homeland and enjoy being Russian. As for the less progressive audience, it is even needless to mention them. “We are Russians, what a delight it is!” – that was the feeling that swelled up in everyone’s heart. (Izvestiya. February 112014).

In example (8), “the foundation” is defined as “a solid structure that supports a building” (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994), and the metaphor suggests that patriotism is seen as a solid support for Russian statehood. While there is nothing intrinsically wrong or not trustworthy about the foundation itself, the idea that a country should need a *moral* foundation, with “moral” meaning “relating to the standards of good or bad behaviour, *rather than to laws*” (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994), can imply that the country’s citizens are used to not relying on laws, or that laws fail to work effectively. In (9), “a refuge” is defined as “a place that gives protection from danger or unhappiness” (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994). Thus, the metaphor implies that patriotism is a secured place, free of danger or unpleasant feelings. At the same time, it also says that this place serves as a shelter for a person without any moral principles (a scoundrel) turning, in effect, the positive connotation into a negative one.

The **PATRIOTISM is SPACE/CONTAINER** conceptualization pattern is found almost as frequently as the previous one (9,1%).

- (1) I think they (deputies) just heard somewhere that it is politically trendy to criticize American MacDonald’s and they decided to put yet another tick in the “Patriotism” box. (Komsomol’skaya Pravda. August 4 2014).

One of the source domains for PATRIOTISM is SPACE/CONTAINER. In example (10), the word combination “check or tick the box” is not used in its basic meaning (to put V in a square), which pertains to filling in paper documents, but displays another meaning in this context – “to formally report, disapprovingly” (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994). Based on the analogy, the target domain concept, PATRIOTISM is mapped to the source domain concept, SPACE (completed critical report form, complainant’s or reprimander’s form). Thus, patriotism, like any other paper completion, when approached formally and bureaucratically, not meaningfully, may be disapproved of by members of the society.

PATRIOTISM is BODY is another conceptualization pattern found in the subcorpus (7,3%).

(11) Patriotism and nationhood are the two shoulders Russia has always rested on.

(12) The very reference to hero-cities makes their teeth grind and they fight in another fit of impotent rage.

(13) They have, again, had “bad luck to rule such people”, who find “tanned patriotism” more appealing than the moral crisis of poisoned consciousness. (Komsomol’skaya Pravda. July 272014)

Example (11) reflects the idea of patriotism as viewed by politicians and public authorities, who frame it as a solid support for Russian statehood. From this perspective, as it follows from the definition of “shoulder” as “a part of the torso from neck to arm” (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994), the metaphor suggests that patriotic feelings serve as a hull which keeps other parts of the body together. Another function of the body metaphor is to imply that shoulders, being a part of a human back, help to keep a torso upright, thus, function properly and effectively. It suggests that patriotism is something that prevents Russia and its citizens from breaking down in the face of adversity and hardship.

An alternative “folk” view of patriotism in (12) and (13) treats it mainly as loyalty to one’s motherland, which is translated through living in your native country without leaving it, caring about people, preserving cultural heritage and history and withstanding any severities. Therefore, the grassroots are commonly critical of those who left the country, in search of a better life but still claim to be patriots from abroad and pretend to be part of the country, living a stable and relaxed life overseas. This attitude becomes obvious in (13), where patriotism of the kind is referred to as “tanned”.

Another conceptualization pattern found in the subcorpus is **PATRIOTISM is FORCE/POWER** (6,1%).

(14) The hostilities haven’t started yet but the opinion polls show that the proportion of those willing to defend Sevastopol from Bandera gangs and those who would rather sit at home is 84% to 16%. This natural, not official patriotism, not the one which is handed down from above, is a powerful force. The most useless thing authorities might do now is to ignore this impetus. (Izvestiya. February 252014)

(15) Patriotism is often seen as power and statism, as the main driving force of any change (Vedomosti. July 112016).

In examples (14) and (15) patriotism is conceptualized as force, i.e. “the ability of living beings to perform physical actions, movements by muscle tension” (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994), as love for one’s country is increasingly associated with issues of national security, the need to preserve the current political system and state sovereignty. Such patriots are commonly referred to by sociologists as “blind”, implying their unconditional love for the motherland, an unquestioning positive attitude to their homeland

and intolerance to criticism of their state. Understanding of power, literally, as a purely physical force, is then transferred to the might and political weight of the country in the international arena. Metaphorically, the force or power is conceptualized as the spiritual strength of the Russian people, their perseverance and invincibility in the face of any threats to their country.

The *PATRIOTISM is FOOD* conceptualization pattern is the least frequently used conceptualization pattern (4,2%).

(16) But the meaning of kvass is by no means reduced to the utilitarian side. It has become one of the most characteristic and recognizable national symbols, an image of Russian identity, equally recognized by both Russophiles and Russophobes. The latter even coined the mocking word “a kvass patriot” (Izvestiya. December 192014).

(17) People have nothing to eat, the euro rate has skyrocketed because of the unreasonable costs of the Olympics. Do they want to feed the people with patriotism? So we are fed up with it!!! (Novosibirsk online. February 1 2015)

The expression “a kvass patriot” in example (16) is not only metaphorical, but also has cultural and historical implications. The reference to kvass, an old Russian “sour drink infused with yeast on malt, as well as on rye bread or bread crumbs” (Ozhegov & Shvedova, 1994) in relation to patriotism, goes back to 1827, when Prince Peter Vyazemsky was the first to introduce the idea of kvass patriotism as a servile one. It is opposed to genuine patriotism and is the praise of everything that is ours (state, national), admiration for all forms of the country’s everyday life and condemnation of everything alien. The expression is currently used ironically or disapprovingly to stress the distorted moral values of pseudo-patriots.

Similarly, example (17) emphasizes the idea that ordinary citizens are not content with the current standard of living, high unemployment rate, low wages, and the government hardly does anything to improve the economic situation. Instead, the politicians and public figures repeatedly refer to the importance of patriotism as the only national idea. Metaphorically, patriotism alone is not sufficiently nutritious food for Russians to satiate their hunger, so it should be supplemented by other dishes.

The obtained corpus data suggest that patriotic discourses vary greatly as they rely on diverging patriotic narratives, which gives rise to competing metaphoric models of patriotism. The data have been analysed mostly descriptively. Yet, some initial considerations speak in favour of the contested nature of Russian patriotism, as reflected in the views of both politicians and public officials, and mass and social media actors. The opponents of constructing the new type of patriotism in Russia, being critical of the current techniques of instilling pride for the nation, argue that pro-government mass media are mainly involved in sorting out the Russian electorate into patriots and traitors. Such dichotomy is particularly advantageous to the ruling elites.

Discussion and Conclusions

The Russian patriotic discourse as a special social convention, until recently being sacralized by the tradition of national and public protection, has become dominated by multicontextual representation in public and mediated communication. Social and mass media have become the space where the ideas of “new” patriotism emerge, revealing the divergence in official and popular patriotic discourse. The latter is reflective of folk ideas

of patriotism, where norms and social conventions may deviate or contradict the ones officially foregrounded. This is where metaphor, as the findings suggest, becomes a powerful conduit for articulating various views of constructing patriotism and national pride.

Answering the first question about the major metaphors employed in the discursive construction of Russian patriotism, the corpus-based study suggests that patriotism discourse is mainly structured by sports/gambling, gardening/breeding and (im-)morality metaphors. Russian patriotism is conceptualized in mass media predominantly as an exciting risky gambling activity or forces exploited for corrupt purposes, perpetrated by people opposing the official public ideologized view of patriotism, evoking negative feelings.

Other conceptualization patterns include building, human body, market commodity/business and food metaphors distributed in the subcorpus with a frequency of occurrence of 10% and below. These representations of patriotism show certain controversy. On the one hand, the existential features of patriotism are seen positively, on the other hand, public actions and the resulting practices applied to construct it can be negative. Therefore, essentially positive feelings towards one's country are negatively exploited. Thus, the results support the initial hypothesis of patriotism as a contested concept.

As far as a certain variation in preferred metaphors is concerned, the initial observations on the metaphors in the research sample enable us to conclude that politicians, mass and social media resort to different sets of metaphors. The official public discourse is ripe with building metaphors, gardening/breeding as well as morality metaphors, foregrounding the idea that patriotism is the fundamental value and the only solid basis for Russia and its citizens, which should be nurtured and "grown" in younger generations. Journalists and printed media most frequently employ human body and force metaphors emphasizing that patriotic sentiments cannot be imposed on people, and should arise naturally. The folk conception of patriotism relies on gambling and food metaphors as citizens mainly complain of being pawns in politicians' games and of being fed up with the patriotic food on TV, which is disgusting.

Unlike metaphors of patriotism found in previous research on other countries (Baruh & Popescu, 2008; Coleman et al., 2018; Flowerdew & Leong, 2007; Lu & Ahrens, 2008; McAdams et al., 2008; Zinken, 2003), Russian metaphors of patriotism do not rely on the family and interpersonal relationship model, but prefer the models referring to the domains of nature, construction, morality and competition. In essence, metaphors of patriotism in the Russian language do not conceptualize interpersonal relationships in the society, but conceptualize the feelings towards one's country with regard to nature, man-made constructions, or human activity, i.e. external contexts beyond one's control. It supports the common opinion that historical events, for example, the victory in the Great Patriotic War – a major country's pride which is external to the control of contemporary citizens and public authorities – would cause the unifying positive sense of patriotism, which current political leaders and public figures would prefer to make use of for the sake of social action.

The answer to the final question, on the role of these metaphors in constructing patriotism-based Russian national identity is manifold. Like any abstract concept, the notion of patriotism is highly complex and ambiguous, and discourse metaphor serves as an explanatory mechanism revealing the subtle culture-specific nuances of

conceptualizing patriotism which are not otherwise clear and obvious. The rich repertoire of metaphoric representations of Russian patriotism suggests that the construction of the Russian national identity is far from being complete, so metaphors are helpful in exposing areas of concern on the patriotic policies agenda. Moreover, since most concepts in political discourse are contested and their nature is strikingly deceptive, metaphors in discourse function as a powerful framing tool, enabling us to frame patriotism to the advantage of certain politicians, or reframe it by overshadowing other problematic issues. As metaphors reflect evaluative biases related to particular source domains, the study is complementary to the investigation of preferential conceptualizations and cross-domain mappings in metaphorical language use. The persuasive potential of source domains is measured/compared, as metaphorical mappings preserve the cognitive topology of the source domain, in a way that is consistent with the inherent structure of the target domain.

The study is by no means entirely comprehensive or exhaustive, and is not devoid of research limitations and further prospects. Reservations for generalization of the conclusions are the limited sample in within-culture variation, obtained from RNC newspaper subcorpus. Modern media have increasingly become multimodal. By eliciting visual metaphors of patriotism, we could identify overlapping metaphorical models in different modalities and genres, and observe differences in conceptualizing patriotism at the inferential level of analysis. The enriched data may contribute to previous extensive evidence that individuals perceive visual and textual stimuli differently. Another promising line of research is to empirically test, in a series of experiments, if respondents' views of patriotism change as a result of their previous exposure to a particular metaphor, thus suggesting the manipulative potential of metaphor in discourse. Practical recommendations upon the conclusions may involve advice to reporting journalists on the contested concepts and particular sources of these in metaphors.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributors

Dr Inna V. Skrynnikova is an associate professor in the Department of German and Romance Philology, Volgograd State University, Russia. Her research interests are cognitive linguistics, neurolinguistics, psycholinguistics, political linguistics and multimodal communication.

Dr Tatiana M. Permyakova is a professor in the Department of Foreign Languages, HSE University (Perm, Russia). Her research interests are intercultural communication theories, discourse analysis with emphasis on EFL and ELT situations, English for specific purposes, professional and business communication.

Dr Ekaterina V. Pozdeeva is an associate professor in the Department of Foreign Languages, HSE University (Perm, Russia). Her research interests are intercultural communication theories, cognitive linguistics and translation studies.

ORCID

Inna Skrynnikova  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2390-7866>
 Tatiana Permyakova  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4960-5038>
 Ekaterina Pozdeeva  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9468-0921>

References

- Adorno, T., Frenkel-Brenswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (2019). *The authoritarian personality*. Verso Books.
- Ariely, G. (2017). Evaluations of patriotism across countries, groups, and policy domains. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44(3), 462–481. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1319761>
- Bar-Tal, D. (1993). Patriotism as fundamental beliefs of group members. *Politics & the Individual*, 3(2), 45–62.
- Baruh, L., & Popescu, M. (2008). Guiding metaphors of nationalism: The Cyprus issue and the construction of Turkish national identity in online discussions. *Discourse & Communication*, 2(1), 79–96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481307085578>
- Bresnahan, M., Chen, Y., & Fedewa, K. (2018). Extinguishing Lady Liberty’s torch? Online public responses to the U.S. executive order to ban immigrants from 7 countries. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 47(6), 564–580. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2018.1520737>
- Brubaker, R. (2004). In the name of the nation: Reflections on nationalism and patriotism. *Citizenship Studies*, 8(2), 115–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1362102042000214705>
- Budaev, E. V., & Chudinov, A. P. (2008). Kognitivno-diskursivnyj analiz metafory v politicheskoy kommunikacii [Cognitive-discursive analysis of metaphor in political communication]. *Politicheskaya Lingvistika [Political Linguistics]*, 3(26), 37–48. <https://www.elibrary.ru/contents.asp?id=33274512&selid=11684839>
- Cammaerts, B. (2012). The strategic use of metaphors by political and media elites: The 2007–11 Belgian constitutional crisis. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, 8(2/3), 229–249. https://doi.org/10.1386/macp.8.2-3.229_1
- Charteris-Black, J. (2003). Speaking with forked tongue: A comparative study of metaphor and metonymy in English and Malay phraseology. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18(4), 289–310. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327868MS1804_5
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Springer.
- Charteris-Black, J., & Musolff, A. (2003). “Battered hero” or “innocent victim”? A comparative study of metaphors for euro trading in British and German financial reporting. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22(2), 153–176. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(02\)00012-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(02)00012-1)
- Coleman, M. J., Harris, T. M., Bryant, K. L., & Reif-Stice, C. (2018). A cultural approach to patriotism. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 11(3), 173–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17513057.2018.1454974>
- Deignan, A. (2003). Metaphorical expressions and culture: An indirect link. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18(4), 255–271. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327868MS1804_3
- Doob, L. W. (1964). Patriotism and nationalism: Their psychological foundations. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 8(3), 27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000276426400800308>
- Evans, M. D., & Kelley, J. (2002). National pride in the developed world: Survey data from 24 nations. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 14(3), 303–338. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/14.3.303>
- Federico, C. M., Golec, A., & Dial, J. L. (2005). The relationship between the need for closure and support for military action against Iraq: Moderating effects of national attachment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(5), 621–632. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271588>

- Flowerdew, J., & Leong, S. (2007). Metaphors in the discursive construction of patriotism: The case of Hong Kong's constitutional reform debate. *Discourse & Society*, 18(3), 273–294. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926507075476>
- Forceville, C. (2016). Pictorial and multimodal metaphor (2016). In N. M. Klug & H. Stöckl (Eds.), *Handbuch Sprache im multimodalen Kontext [Handbook of Language in Multimodal Contexts]* (pp. 241–260). Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110296099-011>
- Gangl, K., Torgler, B., & Kirchler, E. (2016). Patriotism's impact on cooperation with the state: An experimental study on tax compliance. *Political Psychology*, 37(6), 867–881. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12294>
- Gerd, A. (ed.) (2011). *Bol'shoy akademicheskiy slovar' russkogo yazyka [The academic dictionary of the Russian language]*. (Vol.15). Nauka.
- Hampden-Turner, C., & Trompenaars, A. (1994). *The seven cultures of capitalism: Value systems for creating wealth in the United States, Japan, Germany, France, Britain, Sweden, and the Netherlands*. Piatkus.
- Heuman, A. N., & González, A. (2018). Trump's essentialist border rhetoric: Racial identities and dangerous liminalities. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 47(4), 326–342. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2018.1473280>
- Honohan, I. (2008). Metaphors of solidarity. In T. Carver, J. Pikalo (Eds.), *Political language and metaphor: Interpreting and changing the world* (pp. 69–82). Routledge.
- Huddy, L., & Khatib, N. (2007). American patriotism, national identity, and political involvement. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51(1), 63–77. Retrieved December 23, 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4122906>
- Kecmanovic, D. (1996). National and patriotic feeling. In D. Kecmanovic. *The mass psychology of ethnonationalism. Path in psychology*, (pp.1-14). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-0188-0_1
- Kirchler, E., Hoelzl, E., & Wahl, I. (2008). Enforced versus voluntary tax compliance: The “slippery slope” framework. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 29(2), 210–225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2007.05.004>
- Kitis, E., & Milapides, M. (1997). Read it and believe it: How metaphor constructs ideology in news discourse. A case study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28(5), 557–590. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(97\)00075-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(97)00075-1)
- Konrad, K. A., & Qari, S. (2012). The last refuge of a scoundrel? Patriotism and tax compliance. *Economica*, 79(315), 516–533. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0335.2011.00900.x>
- Kosterman, R., & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 10(2), 257–274. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3791647>
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511614408>
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lantolf, J., & Bobrova, L. (2014). Metaphor instruction in the L2 Spanish classroom: Theoretical argument and pedagogical program. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching*, 1(1), 46–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2014.898515>
- Littlemore, J. (2003). The effect of cultural background on metaphor interpretation. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18(4), 273–288. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327868MS1804_4
- Lu, L. W. L., & Ahrens, K. (2008). Ideological influence on BUILDING metaphors in Taiwanese presidential speeches. *Discourse & Society*, 19(3), 383–408. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926508088966>
- Maalej, Z. (2007). Doing critical discourse analysis with the contemporary theory of metaphor: Towards a discourse model of metaphor. In C. Hart & D. Lukeš (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistics in critical discourse studies: Application and theory* (pp. 132–158). Cambridge Scholars Press.

- McAdams, D. P., Albaugh, M., Farber, E., Daniels, J., Logan, R. L., & Olson, B. (2008). Family metaphors and moral intuitions: How conservatives and liberals narrate their lives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(4), 978–990. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012650>
- Merskin, D. (2007). Flagging patriotism: The myth of old glory. *Jung Journal*, 1(4), 11–16. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jung.2007.1.4.11>
- Musolff, A. (2004). *Metaphor and political discourse: Analogical reasoning in debates about Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Musolff, A. (2006). Metaphor scenarios in public discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 21(1), 23–38. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms2101_2
- Ozhegov, S., & Shvedova, N. (1994). *Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka [Explanatory dictionary of Russian]*. Very Ltd.
- Quinsaas, S. (2014). Competing news frames and hegemonic discourses in the construction of contemporary immigration and immigrants in the United States. *Mass Communication and Society*, 17(4), 573–596. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2013.816742>
- Raagmaa, G. (2002). Regional identity in regional development and planning. *European Planning Studies*, 10(1), 55–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654310120099263>
- Schatz, R., Staub, E., & Lavine, H. (2003). On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology*, 20(1), 151–174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0162-895X.00140>
- Semino, E., & Koller, V. (2009). Metaphor, politics and gender: A case study from Italy. In K. Ahrens (Ed.), *Politics, gender and conceptual metaphors* (pp. 36–61). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Skrynnikova, I. V., & Permyakova, T. M. (2019). Multimodal metaphorical representation of Russian patriotism. In T. V. Romanova (Ed.), *Kognitivnye issledovaniya yazyka. Vyp. 37. Integrativnye processy v kognitivnoj lingvistike: Materialy mezhdunarodnogo kongressa po kognitivnoj lingvistike [Cognitive research into language. Integration processes in cognitive linguistics]* (pp. 377–382). DEKOM.
- Skrynnikova, I. V., & Astafurova, T. N. (2020). Constructing modern Russian identity through discourse metaphors. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznanie. Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics*, 19(3), 107–115. <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2020.3.10>
- Smith, M. B. (2002). The metaphor (and fact) of war. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 8(3), 249–258. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327949PAC0803_09
- Stefanowitsch, A. (2006). Corpus-based approaches to metaphor and metonymy. In A. Stefanowitsch & S. T. Gries (Eds.), *Corpus-based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy* (pp. 1–16). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sunderland, J. (2004). Classroom interaction, gender, and foreign language learning. In B. Norton, K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 222–241). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524834>
- Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behaviour. *Social Science Information*, 13(2), 65–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/053901847401300204>
- Terry, D. J., Hogg, M. A., & White, K. M. (1999). The theory of planned behaviour: Self-identity, social identity and group norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 38(3), 225–244. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466699164149>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2013). *Discourse and power*. (E. A. Kozhemyakin, E. V. Pereverzev, & A. M. Amatova, Trans). (Original work published 2008). Knizhnyy dom “Librokom”
- Wenzel, M. (2002). The impact of outcome orientation and justice concerns on tax compliance: The role of taxpayers' identity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 629–645. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.629>
- Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(1), 126–134. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.1.126>

- Wilson, J., & Hay, M. (2013). Internal media, conceptual metaphors and minority cultural identities. *Ethnicities*, 13(1), 49–67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796812450279>
- Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about – A summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1–13). Sage.
- Yu, N. (2003). Metaphor, body, and culture: The Chinese understanding of gallbladder and courage. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18(1), 13–31. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327868MS1801_2
- Zinken, J. (2003). Ideological imagination: Intertextual and correlational metaphors in political discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 14(4), 507–523. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926503014004005>