

UDC 811.111

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2022.27.2.13>

**ALLUSIVE-BASED METAPHORICAL NOMINATIONS
IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE**

**АЛЮЗИВНІ МЕТАФОРИЧНІ НОМІНАЦІЇ
В ПОЛІТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ**

Zhykharieva O.O.,

orcid.org/0000-0002-1054-3725

*Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages
National Academy of Fine Arts and Architecture*

Stavtseva V.F.,

orcid.org/0000-0002-0034-4757

*Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of English Language and Translation
Kyiv National Linguistic University*

The article focuses on the allusive-based metaphorical nomination to designate the Russian army in the Ukrainian political discourse. The concept of metaphorical multicomponent allusion is introduced into scientific use for the first time, expanding the understanding of the ways of intertextuality in the aspect of the theory of conceptual integration.

The purpose of the article is the comprehensive analysis of the allusion-based metaphors of the Ukrainian political discourse to designate the Russian army. The objectives of the study are to reveal the components of multicomponent allusions that underlie the metaphors of dehumanization of the Russian army while establishing the correlations between the allusion components and the semantic scope of the input spaces and blended space resulting from allusive reference as well as to determine the derogatory strategies of blatant and subtle dehumanization that are achieved by the allusive nominations of the Russian army. To achieve the purpose and objectives the paper applies an integrative method, involving intertextual analysis, supplemented by elements of a method based on the theory of conceptual integration.

Metaphorical multicomponent allusion to designate the Russian army is 'proper' and implicit intertextuality device based on connotative meanings borrowed from the input source space of the precedent texts or memory fields and realizing the strategies of the blatant and subtle dehumanization of the Russian army. This device refers to one precedent situation in its various components, which enter the common space of metaphorical blend and mutually reinforce the dehumanizing meanings of the resulting metaphor.

The paper has singled the metaphorical multicomponent allusions to designate the Russian army and involve the metaphorical models of its dehumanization based on allusions associate the Russian army either with a fantastic dangerous creature underlying the blatant dehumanization or with soulless creatures with human features aimed at the subtle humanization.

The prospect of further research is the analysis of other means of hatred speech in Ukrainian counterpropaganda, as well as pragmatic and discursive strategies of Ukrainian discourse.

Key words: allusions, allusive-based metaphorical nomination, conceptual integration, dehumanization strategies, intertextuality, political discourse.

У статті розглядається алюзивна метафорична номінація на позначення російської армії в українському політичному дискурсі. У науковий обіг вперше вводиться поняття метафоричної багатокomпонентної алюзії, що розширює усвідомлення засобів інтертекстуальності в аспекті теорії концептуальної інтеграції.

Метою статті є комплексний аналіз алюзійних метафор в українському політичному дискурсі на позначення російської армії. Завдання дослідження полягають у виявленні компонентів багатокomпонентних алюзій, що лежать в основі метафор дегуманізації російської армії, з одночасним встановленням кореляції між компонентами алюзії та семантичним обсягом вхідних просторів і змішаного простору, що є результатом алюзивної референції, а також у визначенні стратегій явної та витонченої дегуманізації, які досягаються алюзивними номінаціями російської армії. Для досягнення мети та завдань у роботі застосовано інтегративний метод, що передбачає інтертекстуальний аналіз, доповнений елементами методу, заснованого на теорії концептуальної інтеграції.

Метафорична багатокomпонентна алюзія на позначення російської армії є однозначним, але імпліцитним прийомом інтертекстуальності, заснованим на конотативних значеннях, запозичених із вихідного простору прецедентних текстів або полів пам'яті з метою реалізації стратегії явної та витонченої дегуманізації російської армії. Цей прийом реферує до однієї прецедентної ситуації в її різних компонентах, які входять у спільний простір метафоричного бленду та взаємно посилюють дегуманізаційні значення результуючої метафори.

У статті виділено метафоричні багатокomпонентні алюзії на позначення російської армії та залучено метафоричні моделі її дегуманізації, засновані на алюзіях, що асоціюють російську армію або з фантастичною небезпечною істотою, що лежить в основі відвертої дегуманізації, або з бездушними істотами з людськими рисами, що реалізує стратегію витонченої гуманізації.

Перспективою подальших досліджень є аналіз інших засобів мови ворожнечі в українській контрпропаганді, а також прагматичних і дискурсивних стратегій українського дискурсу.

Ключові слова: алюзія, алюзивна метафорична номінація, концептуальна інтеграція, стратегії дегуманізації, інтертекстуальність, політичний дискурс.

Problem statement. Counteracting destructive information impact of the enemy propaganda involves a wide range of counterpropaganda tools at the verbal, strategic-tactical and ideational levels of Ukrainian discourse, based on facts, cognitive prerequisites, semiospheres of historical and cultural memory. Among the verbal means of Ukrainian counterpropaganda that counteract Russian propaganda in the 2022 war, a significant role belongs to "hatred speech", which includes a wide range of nominations – from derogatory, insulting and mocking words to dehumanizing metaphors and allusions.

The subject of the article analysis is the words of the hatred language, which combine in their conceptual scope a metaphorical dehumanizing component and an allusive reference to the semiospheres of texts that support or enhance the strategy of the enemy's dehumanization.

The article introduces the concept of metaphorical multicomponent allusion, which differs from the existing term "polysemantic" allusion, which is defined "an intertextuality device, which combines two and more facultatively decoded meanings due to their association with more than one precedent source situations, texts or phenomena" [11]. In contrast to the "polysemantic" allusion, the metaphorical multicomponent allusion excludes optional interpretation,

as it refers only to one precedent situation, though in its various components, which become characteristics of the common space of metaphorical blend and mutually reinforce the dehumanizing meanings of the resulting metaphor.

The relevance of the article is determined by its scientific novelty in approach and methodology and its practical significance for optimization of the Ukrainian political discourse as it expects to offer the suitable recommendation for improvement of counterpropagandistic tools avoiding unproductive devices that may reduce the impact of counterpropaganda.

The latest research analysis. The article relies on research on (a) intertextuality [2; 6; 15] underlying the allusive component of the derogatory metaphors to designate the enemy, and (b) the theory of conceptual blending [3; 4; 5] aimed at exploring cognitive metaphors obtained as a result of allusive transfer.

Allusive-based nominations of the enemy belong to the first type of transtextual connections introduced by J. Genette [6] and are marked by means referring to denotata – to precedent texts / pretexts or to certain historical and cultural facts. In this sense, the metaphorical allusions studied by the article are primarily based on universal knowledge, based on world literature and culture. At the same time, considering the material under consideration, the metaphor-based

allusion can be considered as a kind of hypertextuality in the aspect of ridiculing or parodying one text by another, since it contains derogatory connotations associated with the enemy. It is also important for the article to distinguish between 'proper' and 'facultative' [13, p. 20; 14, p. 85–86] and explicit and implicit intertextuality [16] since allusion-based metaphor to designate an enemy is categorized as hatred speech and therefore excludes the possibility of irregular decoding, that is, it cannot be "optional". Meanwhile, it is an implicit reference to the qualities of the enemy, based on connotative semantic increments borrowed from the input source space and realizing the subjective-evaluative function.

In exploring cognitive metaphors derived from the allusive reference this paper relies on the theory of conceptual integration [3; 4; 5], based on a four-space model, constituted by the source and target spaces, a generic space that involves the common features of the input spaces, and a blended space, simulating all spaces in emergent structure. Three blending processes underlying conceptual integration, include composition as an attribution of relations between input spaces, completion as matching the blended structure with background knowledge, and elaboration as the further development of the blend "scenario" with its mental or physical simulation [4].

Considering the nature and functions of metaphor-based allusion as a means of dehumanizing the enemy, the article draws on research that highlights the types of dehumanization. Within interdisciplinary framework the article is based on the types of dehumanization [7; 8; 10] manifested as deindividuation, transformation of the people into an impersonal mass, deprivation of moral traits [17, p. 31] that results in blatant and subtle dehumanization [10, p. 399–423]. The blatant dehumanization is embodied by metaphors aimed at depriving the target group of human features while the subtle or mechanistic dehumanization rely on metaphors designating the enemy as outwardly dehumanized subjects that look like humans, but inwardly positioned as impersonal machines [9].

Purpose statement. In our scientific research, we set ourselves the goal of a comprehensive analysis of the allusion-based metaphors of Ukrainian political discourse to designate the Russian army. The goal involves solving the following tasks: (a) to identify the components of multicomponent allusions that underlie the metaphors of dehumanization of the enemy, (b) to reveal the correlations between the allusion components and the semantic scope of the input spaces and blended space, (c) to define the

derogatory strategies that are achieved by the allusion-based nominations of the enemy in terms of the types of dehumanization and their embodying metaphors, (d) to identify unproductive hatred speech that may reduce the impact of counterpropaganda.

The purpose and objectives of the article determined the main research methods. The article uses the model of cognitive metaphor analysis introduced by G. Fauconnier and M. Turner [3; 4; 5] as this explanatory tool is applied to identify the process of formation of non-conventional, "unexpected" metaphors, as in our case. The research also partially uses the method of analysis of polysemantic allusion, adapted in relation to the object and objectives of the study.

Research results. The paper has singled the metaphorical multicomponent allusions to designate the Russian army and involve the metaphorical models of its dehumanization by associating with a fantastic dangerous creature (blatant dehumanization) as well as with soulless creatures with human features (subtle humanization).

To start with, the most common metaphor *орки* to designate Russian army that is used not only by ordinary Ukrainians and officials, but also by various sources of foreign media.

It is hard in 2022 to resist seeing a parallel with Vladimir Putin's vision of Russia assailed by the West and driven to a self-righteous war of survival against a hostile world. On the other side, the people of Ukraine, not deluded by Eskov, label Putin and his troops the orcs they are [12].

The metaphor *or*, to be more precise, metaphoronymy, in which metaphor and metonymy interact is based on a polycomponent allusion to mythical creatures from Tolkien's novels, where orcs were once elves, but later lost all human semblance. The allusion refers to several semantic scopes of input source space of the metaphor – to the appearance and qualities of creatures that were dirty, not accustomed to living in comfort, disorganized, distinguished by inhuman cruelty and low intelligence and sublimating their anger towards everything living and normal. Another metonymic projection of the allusion is the reference to Sauron-Putin, representing the dark force to which the orcs fear but obey, forming the basis of his armed forces. Despite the fact that the Dark Lord made the orcs what they are they deify him.

Another projection of the metaphorical allusion is that Tolkien's orcs threatened the entire civilized world. Thus, the nomination with its allusive undertones is a derogatory reinterpretation of one of the basic mythologemes of Russian propaganda about Russia as a messiah, aimed at "liberating" the world

by establishing its own values. The metaphonymic model of metaphorical allusion is based on such components as:

Input source space: creatures with inhuman cruelty.

Input target space: Russian army.

Generic (common) space – the appearance of creatures, the color of their clothes, inhuman qualities, fear of the leader and his deification, a threat to the entire civilized world.

BLEND SPACE: Russians are a disorganized army of non-humans, adoring their leader and posing a threat to the civilized world.

Strategy: "blatant dehumanization" through denial of human traits.

Other metaphors aimed at both blatant and subtle dehumanization of the enemy are colorably based on the similarity of St. George's colors with the color of the Colorado potato beetle, "horde", etc.

The metaphorical allusion "horde" deserves the most careful analysis, since in addition to its immediate goal – to be a means of hostile speech, attributing the characteristics of the horde to the enemy, it has wide additional semantic implications correlating with the components of the historical grand narrative of Ukrainians, debunking the enemy's narratives and ideologemes.

From viewpoint of conceptual integration, the process of metaphorization includes:

Input source space – Golden Horde.

Input target space – Russian army.

Generic (common) space: The two input spaces intersect in (a) the common goal – to capture as much territory as possible, (b) in the behavior as the aggressors and robbers, (c) in methods of invasion and qualities – ruthlessness, cruelty, with slaughtering "from small to large" (*Страшенна монгольська орда з далекої степової Азії налетіла на нашу країну* [1, p. 57]), (d) in the consequences of actions, posing a threat to the whole civilized world, (e) superposition of memory fields – the common history: 250-year-old Horde dominion in Rus', as a result of which it adopted the forms of authoritarian rule.

BLEND SPACE: The Russian army behaves like the Horde, reinforcing the narrative about Muscovy as the heir to the Golden Horde.

Strategy: "subtle" dehumanization" of the enemy as the soulless human-like being.

Among derogatory metaphors of the enemy dehumanization by Ukrainian counterpropaganda, which, in our opinion, can become counterproductive, the article identifies such designations as "ватники" (quilted jackets), мокшани (Mokshanas).

The quilts are a metonymic allusion to the semiosphere of the historical memory of Stalin's times, referring to the clothes typical of the prisoners of the Gulag and labor camps. The use of such a name can cause offensive associations among former political prisoners and their descendants since Ukrainians made up a fifth of the Gulag prisoners (more than half a million in the 1950s).

The historical allusion to Mokshanas with the metonymic transfer of the name of one of the tribes that took part in the ethnogenesis of the Russians to all Russians refers to the origin of the Russians from the Finno-Hungarian ethnoses, depriving them of ties with the Slavs. It is aimed at debunking the mythologemes about the Single or brotherly people. However, Mokshanas and other Finno-Ugric tribes became victims of Russian colonization and forced assimilation. In addition, according to genetic studies, Mordva (descendants of Moksha) are closer to Slavs than to Finno-Ugric. Therefore, such a derogatory name, based on pseudo-historical data, is not a productive means of counterpropaganda.

Conclusions. Based on the accepted approaches to the concept of intertextuality and allusion as its subtype, the article introduces the notion of the allusive-based metaphorical nomination, specified in its metaphorical, structural, and functional-strategic facets. For this purpose, an integrative method was applied, involving intertextual analysis, supplemented by elements of a method based on the theory of conceptual integration.

Metaphorical multicomponent allusion to designate the Russian army is 'proper' and explicit intertextuality device based on connotative meanings borrowed from the input source space of the precedent texts or memory fields and realizing the strategies of the blatant and subtle dehumanization of the Russian army. This device refers to one precedent situation in its various components, which enter the common space of metaphorical blend and mutually reinforce the dehumanizing meanings of the resulting metaphor.

The paper has singled the metaphorical multicomponent allusions to designate the Russian army. The metaphorical models of dehumanization based on allusions associate the Russian army either with a fantastic dangerous creature underlying the blatant dehumanization or with soulless creatures with human features aimed at the subtle humanization.

The prospect of further research is the analysis of other means of hatred speech in Ukrainian counterpropaganda, as well as pragmatic and discursive strategies of Ukrainian discourse.

REFERENCES:

1. Франко І. Повісті. Київ: Рад. Школа. 1951. 471 с.
2. Allen, G. (2011). *Intertextuality*. New Critical Idiom. 2nd edition. London, New York: Routledge. 2011.
3. Fauconnier G., Turner M. Conceptual Integration Networks. *Cognitive Science*. 1998. Vol. 22(2). P. 133–187.
4. Fauconnier G., Turner M. Compression and global insight. *Cognitive linguistics*. 2000. 11 (3/4). P. 283–304.
5. Fauconnier G., Turner M. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books. 2002.
6. Genette G. *Palimpsests: literature in the second degree*. (Ch. Newman & C. Doubinsky, Trans.). L.: Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press. 1997.
7. Giner-Sorolla R., Leidner B., Castano E. Dehumanization, Demonization, and Morality Shifting: Path to moral certainty in extremist violence. *Extremism and the Psychology of Uncertainty*. Eds. M.A. Hogg, D.L. Blaylock, Wiley Blackwell, Oxford, London. 2011. P. 165–182.
8. Goff P. A., Eberhardt J. L., Williams M. J., Jackson M. C. Not yet human: Implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2008, Vol. 94, Issue 2. P. 292–306.
9. Haslam N., Dehumanization: An Integrative Review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 2006. Vol. 10, Issue 3. P. 252–264.
10. Haslam N., Loughnan S., Dehumanization and Infrahumanization. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2014. Vol. 65, Issue 1. P. 399–423.
11. Kravchenko N., Chaika O., Blidchenko-Naiko V., Davydova T. (2021). Polysemantic allusion in a polycultural dimension: Definition, structure and semantics (based on Pratchett's Discworld). *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*. 2021. 17(4). P. 1907–1919.
12. MacLachlan Ch. Why are Ukrainians calling Russian invaders 'orcs'? *The spectator*. 10 April 2022. URL: <https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/why-are-ukrainians-calling-russian-invaders-orcs/>
13. Majkiewicz A. *Intertekstualność – implikacje dla teorii przekładu*. PWN, Warszawa. 2008. 328 p.
14. Nycz R. *Tekstowy świat. Poststrukturalizm a wiedza o literaturze*. Warszawa, Kraków. 2000. 348 p.
15. Orr M. *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 2003. 256 p.
16. Piégay-Gros N. *Introduction à l'intertextualité*. Nathan Université. 2002. 186 p.
17. Volpato C., Andrighetto L. Dehumanization. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (Second Edition). 2015. P. 31–37.