

UDC 81'42

IMAGES OF UKRAINE—EU RELATIONS IN CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS OF UKRAINIAN MASS MEDIA

Svitlana Zhabotynska
 (Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy)

Svitlana Zhabotynska. Images of Ukraine—EU relations in conceptual metaphors of Ukrainian mass media. This paper discusses the system of conceptual metaphors reconstructed via analysis of metaphorical expressions (ME) employed by eight popular Ukrainian newspapers (*Holos Ukrainy, Uriadovyi Kurier, Den', Dzerkalo Tyzhnya, Gazeta Po-Ukrains'ky, Segodnya, Ukraina Moloda, and Kommmentarii*) published in January – June, 2016. The ME describe perceptions of the EU, Ukraine, and their cooperation in the target conceptual spaces of POLITICS and ECONOMY. The data are processed according to an authentic methodology applicable to multiple metaphorical expressions [Zhabotynska 2013a; 2013b; 2016]. Grounded on the findings of Conceptual Metaphor Theory [Lakoff and Johnson 1980], this methodology represents an algorithm for exposure and further description of conceptual metaphors applied in a thematically homogeneous discourse, and manifested by multiple ME. Their analysis, aiming to portray some metaphorical system as a whole, provides an in-depth study of its target and source conceptual spaces and an empirically rigorous account of their cross-mapping influenced by the discourse type. In this study focused on mass media political discourse, the reconstructed system of conceptual metaphors demonstrates Ukraine's stance on its relations with the EU and contributes to understanding the role of political metaphor as a mind-shaping device.

Keywords: political images, the EU, Ukraine, Ukrainian newspapers, conceptual metaphor, multiple data, methodology.

Світлана Жаботинська. Образи відносин між Україною та ЄС в концептуальних метафорах українських засобів масової інформації. У статті розглядається система концептуальних метафор, реконструйованих на підставі аналізу метафоричних виразів (МВ), застосованих у 8 українських газетах (*Голос України, Урядовий кур'єр, День, Дзеркало тижня, Газета по-українськи, Сьогодні, Україна молода та Коментарии*), публікації яких охоплюють січень – червень 2016 р. МВ описують сприйняття ЄС, України та їхнього співробітництва у референтних концептуальних царинах ПОЛІТИКА та ЕКОНОМІКА. Опрацювання даних відбувається із залученням автентичної методології, призначеної для аналізу великих масивів метафоричних виразів [Жаботинская 2013а; 2013b; 2016]. Заснована на доробку теорії концептуальної метафори [Lakoff and Johnson 1980], ця методологія надає алгоритм для виявлення і подальшого опису концептуальних метафор, представлених у тематично гомогенному дискурсі і маніфестованих множинними МВ. Їхній аналіз, спрямований на відтворення цілісної метафоричної системи, забезпечує поглиблене дослідження її референтної і корелятивної царин, а також емпірично обгрунтоване пояснення взаємодії цих царин, особливості якої залежать від типу дискурсу. У статті, зосередженій на політичному дискурсі ЗМІ, реконструйована система концептуальних метафор демонструє позиціонування України щодо її відносин із ЄС і сприяє з'ясуванню ролі політичної метафори як засобу формування свідомості.

Ключові слова: політичні образи, ЄС, Україна, українські газети, концептуальна метафора, множинні дані, методологія.

Светлана Жаботинская. Образы отношений между Украиной и ЕС в концептуальных метафорах украинских средств массовой информации. В статье рассматривается система концептуальных метфор, реконструированных на основе анализа метафорических выражений (МВ), использованных в 8 украинских газетах (*Голос України, Урядовий кур'єр, День, Дзеркало тижня,*

Газета по-українськи, Сьогодні, Україна молода та Коментарии), публикации которых охватывают январь – июнь 2016 г. МВ описывают восприятие ЕС, Украины и их сотрудничества в референтных концептуальных сферах ПОЛИТИКА и ЭКОНОМИКА. Обработка данных осуществляется с привлечением аутентичной методологии, предназначенной для анализа больших массивов метафорических выражений [Жаботинская 2013а; 2013b; 2016]. Основанная на наработках теории концептуальной метафоры [Lakoff and Johnson 1980], эта методология предлагает алгоритм для выявления и дальнейшего описания концептуальных метафор, представленных в тематически гомогенном дискурсе и манифестированных множественными МВ. Их анализ, направленный на воспроизведение целостной метафорической системы, обеспечивает углубленное исследование её референтной и коррелятивной сфер, а также эмпирически обоснованное объяснение взаимодействия этих сфер, особенности которого предопределяются типом дискурса. В статье, сосредоточенной на политическом дискурсе СМИ, реконструированная система концептуальных метафор выявляет позиционирование Украины относительно ее взаимоотношений с ЕС и способствует уяснению роли политической метафоры как инструмента для формирования сознания.

Ключевые слова: политические образы, ЕС, Украина, украинские газеты, концептуальная метафора, множественные данные, методология.

Introduction:

Political images and metaphor as a tool of their creation

The image of UKRAINE—EU RELATIONS belongs to the realm of political images – those concerned with interaction of the actors in international and home politics, and with international and domestic public opinions [Sadri and Flammia 2014: 30]. As Fisher [1997: 4] notes, "international relations evolve around interplay of images" (see also [Movahedi 1985; Herrmann *et al.* 1997; Chaban and Bain 2014]). The latter emerge from subjective perception and reconstruction of the "objective international reality" [Movahedi 1985: 3]. One of the key factors involved in the process of such reconstruction, or construal [Langacker 2008; Zhabotynska 2013c], is language by which "any political action <...> is prepared, accomplished, influences and played" [Supriadi 2017:1]. Since the last decades of the previous century, the role of language used in politics has become a field of intensive research [Chomsky 1988/2004; Dijk 1988; Wodak 2009/ 2011; Wodak and Forchtner 2017 among others]. At present, this issue starts to be explored the intersection of image theory developed in International Relations field and cognitive linguistics that aims to expose mental structures underpinning language and speech.

Image theory proposes a way to arrange the study of perceptions in international relations. In this theory, typical images resemble stereotypes that allow people to act on the emotions evoked by their understanding of the relationship. Stereotypical images operate as mental models with schemata-like properties, filling in missing pieces of information and shaping the search for new information and the interpretation of what it means [Herrmann 2013]. A *conceptual schemata* is a cluster of schemas integrated in systemic ways [Herrmann *et al.* 1997: 404]. In cognitive science, a *schema* is understood as a non-specific mental structure that organizes information about our prior experience [Bartlett 1932; Neisser 1967]. In cognitive linguistics, this definition is extended as follows:

Schemas in language are generalizations extracted from linguistic forms and meanings. A schema is a cognitive representation consisting of perceived similarities across many instances of usage. Schemas are essentially routinized, or cognitively entrenched, patterns of experience. They arise via repeated activation of a set of co-existing properties; once sufficiently entrenched, they can be used to produce and understand linguistic expressions. Linguistic expressions are *categorized* by schemas in production and comprehension; in other words, they are licensed to occur by those schemas. In this way, expressions are linked to the knowledge structures that produce them and make them interpretable [Kemmer 2003: 78].

In political discourse, the schemas that construct political images in social consciousness are mostly entrenched through mass media that, in their verbal and non-verbal messages, "tell the

audience 'how to think about' an issue" [Chaban and Bain 2014: 125 citing leading media research]. In this respect, media and power go hand in hand. The conceptions of power distinguish between "tangible power" associated with the use of violence or force, and "intangible power" as the ability to persuade. Media is "an example of intangible power, that is, media influence is often attributed to cultural impact (soft power), as opposed to military advancement (hard power)" [Sadri and Flammia 2014: 31].

Media's portrayal of "Self", or one's own country, and "Others", or other countries, is achieved through the language which is to a large extent metaphorical. According to Kövecses [2018: 125], "a large part of the conceptualization process in the media involves metaphor. Thus, dealing with conceptualization in the media necessarily involves metaphorical conceptualization". Mass media employs conventional metaphorical expressions that have been adapted by speakers of a particular language for describing abstract political concepts with the help of concepts with perceptual, body-related grounds. Such conventional metaphors, unlike unconventional "fresh" metaphors, belong to back-stage cognition. They do not attract the recipients' attention, but they, however, exert a covert influence on their minds and their behavior. Therefore, conventional metaphors may be considered among the evidence in favor of linguistic relativity theory that regards language as a mind-shaping device. The recent data are provided in [Feldman 2008]. As Yavorska and Bohomolov [2010: 51] put it, "political conceptual metaphors, which dovetail with the domain of political activities, are able to influence the process of decision-making, remaining beyond the conscious level of decision-makers" (the translation is mine – S. Z.). That is why metaphor might be an ideal natural laboratory where one could study linguistic effects on cognition [Katz 1998: 33].

Exploration of conventional metaphors as a cognitive phenomenon hidden behind linguistic metaphorical expressions was initiated by Lakoff and Johnson [1980], whose initial conception, known as Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) has been further tested and elaborated in thousands of works. At present, CMT, along with a number of other key conceptions, is a constitutive part of cognitive linguistics. As Supriadi [2017: 7] aptly observes, "cognitive linguistics is an exploration of the fabric of meaning, woven thread by thread from bodily experience and embroidered by metaphor and metonymy". In the study of metaphor, CMT remains a dominant burgeoning field. "Its dominance is in large part due to the fact that CMT made contact with a variety of disciplines and approaches in the study of the human mind and human behavior" [Kövecses 2018: 124-125].

CMT is employed in the studies of diverse linguistic data, including metaphors of political language analyzed by Lakoff himself [1991; 2002; 2008 among others] and his numerous followers who apply the CMT framework to various kinds of political communication – speeches of politicians, interviews with political elites, official political documents, mass media texts, etc. The spectrum of various data viewed from a CMT standpoint is also exemplified by this Special Issue. Some of its contributions, this article included, aim to expose conceptual metaphors in the texts of Ukrainian newspapers which describe the European Union (EU), Ukraine, and their contemporary relations. Informed by CMT, this article proceeds from the assumption that "when we conceptualize an intangible or less tangible domain metaphorically as, and from the perspective of, a more tangible domain, we create a certain metaphorical reality", or a kind of "reality construction" [Kövecses 2018: 127]. In this respect, metaphors are similar to other linguistic phenomena. Just as with metaphor, ordinary language is not a mere reflection of a pre-existing reality but a construction of reality through a categorization entailing the selection of some features as critical and others as non-critical [Goaty 1997: 155]. Metaphor not only illuminates, it conceals. A good metaphor emphasized similarities and deemphasizes dissimilarities [Katz 1998: 33]. Therefore, conceptual metaphors not only shape media language (in its most general sense), but they also construct virtual realities [Kövecses 2018: 138]. Metaphorically created virtual realities may be established intertextually, because metaphors lend coherence to texts through space and time [ibid: 128], or across a variety of discourses considered both historically and simultaneously [ibid: 130]. The study of metaphors from a CMT perspective lends a cognitive dimension to the study of media communication [ibid: 138].

In this article, the discussion outline includes: characteristics of the data, theoretical framework for their analysis, the obtained findings, and the concluding discussion where these findings are considered in their diachronic and synchronic comparison with the similar studies of UKRAINE-EU RELATIONS image.

Data

The dataset is represented by 672 metaphorical expressions (ME) employed in the texts of eight popular Ukrainian newspapers – *Holos Ukrainy*, *Uriadovyi Kurier*, *Den'*, *Dzerkalo Tyzhnya*, *Gazeta Po-Ukrains'ky*, *Segodnya*, *Ukraina Moloda*, and *Kommentarii*. The newspapers, all of which are broadsheets with a sizable circulation, represent the positions of Ukrainian authorities (*Uriadovyi Kurier*, the paper of Ukrainian Parliament – Verkhovna Rada, *Holos Ukrainy*, the paper of the Cabinet of Ministers) and Ukrainian public with a pro-Ukrainian (*Den'*, *Dzerkalo Tyzhnya*, *Gazeta Po-Ukrains'ky*, *Segodnya*, *Ukraina Moloda*) and a pro-Russian (*Kommentarii*) stance. Two newspapers (*Segodnya* and *Kommentarii*) are published in Russian, the others use Ukrainian. The newspapers, published in January-June 2016, were processed on a daily basis by Ukrainian researchers (Y. Hobova, PhD, A. Kryvenko, PhD, Pshenichnykh, PhD, and V. Velivchenko, PhD) of the transnational research project “Crisis, Conflict and Critical Diplomacy: EU Perceptions in Ukraine, Israel and Palestine” (C³EU) (2015-2018) [C³EU, online]. The selected texts feature information about the EU, Ukraine and their relations. The metaphorical expressions used in these texts were selected by MA students of the School of Foreign Languages at Bogdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy, Ukraine, within their graduate course “New Trend in Word-Studies”. The total number of newspaper texts processed by students is 1012 (Table 1). The texts vary in size (Table 2).

Table 1

Sources of metaphorical expressions (ME)

Newspaper	Number of articles	Number of ME
<i>Голос України</i> (<i>Holos Ukrainy / Voice of Ukraine</i>)	205	95
<i>Урядовий кур'єр</i> (<i>Uriadovyi Kurier / Government Courier</i>)	159	99
<i>Сьогодні</i> (<i>Segodnia / Today</i>)	160	87
<i>День</i> ¹ (<i>Den' / Day</i>)	140	59
<i>Україна молода</i> (<i>Ukrayina Moloda / Young Ukraine</i>)	123	73
<i>Дзеркало тижня</i> (<i>Dzerkalo Ty'zhnya / Week's Mirror</i>)	70	89
<i>Газета по-українськи</i> (<i>Gazeta Po-ukrayins'ky / Ukrainian-Fashion Newspaper</i>)	66	73
<i>Коментарії</i> (<i>Kommentarii / Commentaries</i>)	89	97
Total:	1012	672

1. The processed articles from *Den'* newspaper were published in January – March, 2016.

Table 2

Size of processed articles

Size of an article	Number of signs in an article	Number of articles
Small	1000	192
Medium	1000-3000	362
Big	3000-5000	239
Super-big	over 5000	219
Total:		1012

Theoretical framework

This study adopts the theoretical framework suggested in [Zhabotynskaya 2013a; 2013b; 2016] and somewhat modified for the needs of this research.

Traditionally, metaphor is understood as a naming devise or stylistic trope, where words and phrases are used figuratively on the grounds of analogy, or likeness. According to CMT [Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff 1993; Lakoff and Johnson 1999 among others], linguistic metaphors are reflections of conceptual metaphors understood as a cross-mapping of the target and source, where the source, which helps understand an abstract target, is more concrete, tangible and perceptually rooted in bodily experience. It is important that, unlike the other theories of metaphor focused on cross-mapping of individual concepts, CMT highlights cross-mapping of *conceptual domains* as coherent mental spaces constituted by a number of related concepts. Hence, conceptual metaphors are typically represented not by a single metaphorical expression, but by their sets.

In a conceptual metaphor *the target* is a concept / domain which is to be defined via comparison with another concept / domain; and *the source* is a concept / domain with which the target is compared, and which is employed in its manifestation. The cross-mapping of the source and target [Lakoff 1993: 245] means that certain characteristics of the source are mapped on the certain characteristics of the target. Such mapping includes *entailments, or inferences* [Lakoff and Johnson 1999: 47]: those constituents of the source domain which are not linguistically explicit may be inferred from the meaning of linguistic forms. For example, in the conceptual metaphor AN ARGUMENT IS A JOURNEY (*We'll proceed in a step-by-step fashion. We have covered a lot of ground*), PARTICIPANTS in the argument correspond to TRAVELLERS, the ARGUMENT itself corresponds to A JOURNEY and the PROCESS of the argument corresponds to the route taken [Evans and Green 2006: 299]. In the source domain, the source constituent TRAVELLERS, not named in the linguistic expressions, is inferred.

Selective choice of the target's properties represented via metaphor relates to the phenomenon of *highlighting / hiding*: when the target is structured in terms of a particular source, this highlights certain aspects of the target while simultaneously hiding, or leaving deactivated, its other aspects [Evans and Green 2006: 303-304]. Hence, conceptualizing of different properties of the target may require more than one source. Several sources mapped on the same target form *the range of metaphor* [Kövecses 2002: 64]. In its turn, one and the same source may interact with several targets, which form *the scope of metaphor* [Kövecses 2000: 80]. Interaction of the source and target domains may result in emergence of multiple ME numbering dozens and over. Analysis of multiple metaphorical data requires a methodology which extends CMT with new issues.

The proposed methodology for processing multiple metaphorical data obtained from a thematically homogeneous discourse represents a complex algorithm which enables a detailed analysis of the target and source conceptual spaces, as well as their cross-mapping.

1. The analysis of the *target conceptual space* includes exposure of its domains (thematically coherent related parts) and their structuring with the help of a network or matrix model. A matrix is defined as a network where the links of its nodes are left implicit.
2. The analysis of the *source conceptual space* includes thematic grouping of its concepts into thematically coherent domains.
3. The analysis of *cross-mapping* between the target and source conceptual spaces has such consecutive stages:

3.1. Exposure of the general schemas of conceptual metaphors. This should take into account the factor of congruent and incongruent mapping between the source and target domains (see [Zhabotynskaya 2013a; 2013b] for details). Congruent mapping is compatible with "event structure metaphor" [Lakoff 1993: 220]. In such metaphor, one concept / domain is metaphorically structured in terms of another concept / domain [Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 14]. "Event structure metaphor" includes several constitutive metaphors and their inferences that represent one and the same event. For instance, the general metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY is constituted by several specific metaphors: <States are locations> (*He's at a crossroad in his life*), <Change is motion> (*He went from his forties to his fifties without a hint of a mid-life crisis*), <Causes are forces> (*He got a head start in his life*), <Purposes are destinations> (*I can't even seem to get where I want to be in life*), etc. [Evans and Green 2006: 299]. Metaphorical interaction in which the source domain represents only one event whose structure is mapped onto the target domain may be termed "congruent mapping". It yields only one general metaphorical schema.

Meanwhile, ME, being multiple, happen to demonstrate incongruent mapping, in which projection of one and the same source domain onto the target domain exposes presence of several events (with their own structure), which necessitates coining several metaphorical schemas within a projection. Incongruent mapping occurs when:

- a) one and the same concept in the target domain relates to different concepts in the source domain, and such relations are incompatible within event. For instance, in the Russian language the metaphorical link HUMAN LIFE (target domain) is a JOURNEY (source domain) is manifested with the metaphorical expressions *его постоянно сопровождают невзгоды* / 'he is constantly accompanied by mischief' (where mischief is "a co-traveler"), and *он вынужден преодолевать невзгоды* / 'he has to overcome mischief' (where mischief is "an obstacle on the path"). Since mischief as "a co-traveler" and mischief as "an obstacle on the path" are incompatible within one and the same event, the metaphorical link HUMAN LIFE is a JOURNEY should be represented by two conceptual metaphors rendered by the general schemas HUMAN LIFE is A JOURNEY (where mischief may be "a co-traveler"), and HUMAN LIFE is OVERCOMING OBSTACLES (where mischief is "an obstacle on the path");
- б) one and the same concept in the source domain relates to different concepts in the target domain, and such relations are incompatible within one and the same event. For example, in the metaphor HUMAN LIFE is a JOURNEY the target domain HUMAN LIFE includes the concepts PROFESSION and PERSONAL RELATIONS, both of which can be thought of as a JOURNEY (Russian metaphorical expressions *они далеко ушли в своей профессии* / 'they are far away in their profession', and *они далеко зашли в своих отношениях* / 'they went far in their relationship'). In this case, we need two general metaphorical schemas: PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS is A JOURNEY, and PERSONAL REALTIONS is A JOURNEY.

Incongruent mapping requires specification, or a split of the general metaphorical schema into several sub-schemas within cross-mapping of the same target and source domains.

- 3.2. Compiling the list of conceptual metaphors (in terms of general schemas and sub-schemas) for each target domain; exposing salience of these metaphors (according to the number of ME, or their naming density).
- 3.3. Elaboration of the general metaphorical schemas in the form of schematic descriptions corresponding to an "event structure" in congruent mapping.
4. The analysis of the *target metaphorical space in its relation to the source space* comprises: (a) exposure of the *metaphorical range* possessed by each target domain / concept (according to the number of its source domains / concepts); (b) establishment of *metaphorical salience* exhibited by each target domain / concept (according to the number of ME and the amplitude of metaphorical range).
5. The analysis of the *source metaphorical space in its relation to the target space* embraces: (a) exposure of the *metaphorical scope* possessed by each source domain / concept (according to the number of its target domains / concepts); (b) establishment of *metaphorical capacity* demonstrated by each source domain / concept (with regard to the number of ME and the amplitude of metaphorical scope). Metaphorical capacity of a domain / concept is culture- and discourse-dependent; the domains / concepts with a high metaphorical capacity may differ in different cultures, and in different thematically homogeneous discourses.

The above complex procedure, previously tested on the data obtained from different kinds of thematically related texts [Brovchenko 2011; Radchenko 2012; Zhabotynskaya 2016], shapes the framework of this research focused on the image of UKRAINE—EU RELATIONS which represents metaphorically created virtual reality inferred intertextually and thus providing thematic homogeneity of the studied newspaper texts. The further research has three stages.

At the first stage, the concept of UKRAINE—EU RELATIONS is considered as the target conceptual space of metaphorical expressions. This space is structured, and its constituent parts are analyzed with regard to their metaphorical salience.

The second stage of the analysis provides the list of conceptual metaphors defined in terms of general metaphorical schemas. This list is reduced to the most salient conceptual metaphors manifested by the majority of ME from the dataset. The salient metaphorical schemas are viewed as the ones with different degrees of salience. Then, the metaphorical schemas are elaborated into schematic metaphorical descriptions which generalize the meanings of particular ME and tend to evolve on two levels. For example (the number in the slanted brackets shows the quantity of ME):

EU and UKRAINE are PARTNERS POLITICS (EU—UKRAINE: 4 ME)

- **A PARTNER (EU) /3/ – who is attractive /3/:** who is important for the other partner (UKRAINE) /2/: *Українці вже показали на Майдані, наскільки бажають тіснішої співпраці та інтеграції з Європою* (Газета по-українськи 42-1); *Євросоюз — надзвичайно важливий стратегічний партнер України* (Україна молода 22/01/16); on whom the other partner (UKRAINE) should not turn her back /1/: *Або ми залишаємося провідною країною в Європі, або ми взагалі зменшимо свій вплив у світі, повернувшись спиною до ЄС* (Дзеркало тижня 13/02/16); **who is cooperated with /1/:** with whom the other partner (UKRAINE) has a dialogue /1/: *Започаткування діалогу з ЄС передбачає підвищення ефективності й відповідальності органів влади на всіх рівнях — як під час самих переговорів, так і в реалізації конкретних рішень* (Дзеркало тижня 20/02/16).

In the conceptual metaphors that portray relations, the metaphorical schemas and their elaborations are developed with regard to the relational foregrounded focus. In the above example, ME foreground the EU as a participant of Ukraine—EU relations.

The third stage of the analysis is concerned with the metaphorical capacity of the source concepts employed in the most salient conceptual metaphors. These source concepts prescribe particular roles to the actors involved in Ukraine—EU relations (the EU, Ukraine, and

Russia). The prescribed roles possess different degrees of metaphorical salience that depends on the number of respective ME.

All three stages of the research include quantitative analysis which entails the conclusions as to the metaphorical salience, or prominence, of particular constituents in the target conceptual space, the actors represented here, the conceptual metaphors that result from cross-mapping of the source and target spaces, and the roles projects by the sources upon the targets. The conclusions as to the salience of a particular phenomenon testify to its "visibility" in the newspaper texts, which, in its turn, dovetails with priming. *Priming*, or the state of being "pre-programmed" for a particular conceptual response, is based on the simulation of some experience in the situational, discourse, bodily, and conceptual-cognitive context [Kövecses 2018: 134]. It means that frequent repetitions contribute to creating entrenched images, or stereotypes, which is important for politics. It is plausible to presume that priming demonstrated by conceptual metaphors employed in media texts is "double-scope". On the one hand, the frequently used metaphoric associations may be primed by the writers' environment or stance. An observation that bears on this issue is that of Supriadi [2017: 7] who notes that "metaphor is motivated by relevant information that is salient in human experience; it highlights some facts about the target domain, but hides others. The behavior of metaphor is likewise well-motivated but not entirely predictable". On the other hand, the frequently used metaphorical associations, are registered, repeated and thus made salient in the texts read by the public. Therefore, due to their salience, they become entrenched in the public consciousness. As a result, one member of the metaphorical doublet "target – source" triggers the other member. Or, as Sadri and Flammia [2014: 30] put it, "when the two cue words are constantly meshed together in a single message, many people <...>, begin to form an association" [Sadri and Flammia 2014: 30]. This study is to expose such associations pertinent to Ukraine—EU relations.

Findings

1. UKRAINE—EU RELATIONS as the target conceptual space of metaphorical expressions

UKRAINE—EU RELATIONS is a narrative-based conceptual space reconstructed from ME used in a bulk of texts. The way of structuring such conceptual spaces is proposed in [Zhabotynskaya 2017]. The analysis of data shows that the ME describe Ukraine—EU relations in two conceptual domains – those of POLITICS and ECONOMY. These domains are populated by four actors: Ukraine, the EU, Russia, and the world. The actors *per se* and the links between them become sub-domains, or the domains' constitutive parts. The sub-domains exposed in the ME are the EU, UKRAINE, EU—UKRAINE, EU—RUSSIA, EU—UKRAINE—RUSSIA, and EU—WORLD (Table 3).

Table 3

Metaphorical targets and their salience

Target domains, metaphorical expressions (ME), conceptual metaphors (CM)	Target sub-domains	Number of ME	Number of CM
POLITICS (536 ME / 37 CM)	EU	154	8
	UKRAINE	32	7
	EU—UKRAINE	227	12
	EU—RUSSIA	10	1
	EU—UKRAINE—RUSSIA	104	4
	EU—WORLD	9	5
ECONOMY (136 ME / 23 CM)	EU	21	6
	UKRAINE	15	5
	EU—UKRAINE	100	12
Total:		672	60

According to Table 3, the domain of POLITICS has a higher metaphorical salience than the domain of ECONOMY. The number of ME naming the first domain is four times as large compared with the number of ME naming the second domain; and the number of conceptual metaphors (CM) tracked in the first domain exceed those in the second domain. Among the target

sub-domains, the salient ones are EU—UKRAINE (327 ME, and 24 CM), EU (175 ME, and 14 CM), and UKRAINE (47 ME, and 12 CM).

The data obviously emphasizes metaphorical salience, and thus primary political importance of the topic EU—UKRAINE.

2. Conceptual metaphors representing UKRAINE—EU RELATIONS

Among 60 conceptual metaphors employed for portraying UKRAINE—EU RELATIONS, 13 have sufficiently higher naming density, approximating 10 and more ME (Table 4).

Table 4

Salient conceptual metaphors

Conceptual metaphors	Domains	Number of ME	Total
1. EU is A PERSON	Politics Economy	65 14	79
2. UKRAINE IS A PERSON	Politics Economy	20 7	27
3. EU is AN AUTHORITY; UKRAINE is A SUBORDINATE	Politics	55 (EU) +24 (U)	79
4. EU is AN ASSISTANT; UKRAINE is AN ASSISTED PERSON	Politics Economy	55 (EU)+3 (U) 22 (EU)+2 (U)	82
5. EU and UKRAINE are PARTNERS	Politics Economy	4 (EU) 12 (EU)+ 1 (U)	17
6. EU and RUSSIA are PARTNERS	Politics	10 (EU)	10
7. RUSSIA is AN AGGRESSOR; UKRAINE is A VICTIM; EU is THE VICTIM'S ALLY and THE AGGRESSOR'S ADVERSARY	Politics	8 (R) + 14 (U) + 8 (EU) + 67 (EU)	97
8. EU is a FAMILY	Politics Economy	40 3	43
9. EU is A BUILDING	Politics Economy	43 7	50
10. UKRAINE is A BUILDING	Politics Economy	9 4	13
11. EU is A TERRITORY	Politics Economy	12 35	47
12. UKRAINE is A TERRITORY	Economy	8	8
13. UKRAINE'S EUROPEAN INTEGRATION is A PATH	Politics Economy	58 7	65
Total:	Politics Economy	495 122	617

The salient conceptual metaphors subsume 617 ME, or 91,8% of their total number (672). Therefore, the further research will focus on these metaphors.

Table 4 demonstrates that salient CM have different degrees of prominence. The most prominent are the CM of personification, where the actors of international relations (the EU, Ukraine and Russia) are conceptualized either as persons with particular characteristics or persons performing particular roles. *The first-degree prominence* is exhibited by four CM with the number of ME varying in between **79 and 97**. These CM are: (1) RUSSIA is AN AGGRESSOR; UKRAINE is A VICTIM; EU is THE VICTIM'S ALLY and THE AGGRESSOR'S ADVERSARY /97 ME/, (2) EU is AN ASSISTANT; UKRAINE is AN ASSISTED PERSON /82 ME/, and (3) EU is AN AUTHORITY; UKRAINE is A SUBORDINATE /79 ME/, and (4) EU is A PERSON /79 ME/. *The second-degree prominence* is demonstrated by the other four CM with the number of ME varying in between **41 and 65**. They are: (1) UKRAINE'S EUROPEAN INTEGRATION is A PATH /65 ME/, (2) EU is A BUILDING /50 ME/, EU is A TERRITORY /47 ME/, and (4) EU is A FAMILY /43 ME/. The five remaining conceptual metaphors, with the number of ME varying in between **8 and 27** may be defined as those having *the third degree of prominence*.

In Table 4, the conceptual metaphors are formulated in terms of metaphorical schemas. Their schematic descriptions summarizing the meaning ME, are given below. In these descriptions, the pronouns "he" and "she" in the metaphors of personification agrees with the gender of respective proper names in Ukrainian and Russian, where the EU is masculine ("he"), while Ukraine and Russia are feminine ("she").

1. EU is A PERSON /79ME/ POLITICS (EU: 56 ME)

a well-to-do person /2/: a well-to-do person who is attractive for others (REFUGEES, MIGRANTS) /2/; **an experienced person /1/:** who has learned the lessons of the past /1/; **a powerful person /22/:** who has authority /4/, who is a judge /1/, who makes decisions /3/, controls others (MEMBER STATES) /1/, gives and denies something /2/, who has an instrument (AN INFLUX OF MIGRANTS) to handle others (MEMBER-STATES) /1/, who sets the agenda /4/, and is persistent in doing something (INTERMINGLING THE NATIONS) /1/, who creates something (PROJECTS, INSTITUTIONS) /1/, encourages others to take action /1/, insists on something /1/, assumes responsibility /1/, and has to keep to his promises and commitments /1/; **a person who is not almighty /2/:** who is unable to solve the others' problems (THE WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST) [1], who cannot guarantee security of his partners (OTHER COUNTRIES) /1/; **an assistant /4/:** who helps other people (MEMBER-STATES AND OTHER COUNTRIES) /4/; **a person with faults /9/:** who may be over-egocentric and self-centred /2/, who has moral defects /1/, who may not stick to his word /1/, be forgetful about some events (THE USA'S ESPIONAGE) /1/, be blind, and not to see violations happening nearby /1/, be permanently "concerned" /1/, who is accused of hypocrisy /1/, and who responds to criticism in his address /1/; **an inconsistent person /2/:** whose confusing actions (FOREIGN POLICY) undermine his own building (NATO) /2/; **a person who has problems /4/:** who survives a crisis /2/, whose heart (BRUSSELS) is targeted at by the enemy (TERRORISM) /1/, and who has to take security measures /1/; **a person who displays emotions /4/:** who is unhappy with somebody (MEMBER STATES) /2/, who condemns something (CONFLICTS) /1/, who is shocked by something (SYRIAN REFUGEES), and who feels deep sorrow for something (DEATH OF THE SYRIAN CITY ALEPPO) /1/; **a person who is differently treated /6/:** whose friendship some people (OTHER COUNTRIES) seek /2/, some people (TURKEY) reject and look for new friends /3/, and some people (SOMALI, SUDAN) ignore /1/.

POLITICS (EU—UKRAINE: 9 ME):

a callous person /8/: who is unwilling to see the problems (POVERTY, PRISONERS OF WAR, AND BRUTALITIES IN DONBAS) of the other person (UKRAINE) /5/, whose sympathy should be aroused by the mischief of the other person (UKRAINE) /3/; **a detached person /1/:** who is not eager to embrace the other person (UKRAINE) /1/.

ECONOMY (EU: 14 ME)

an assistant /4/: who helps others (MEMBER-STATES) /4/; **a partner /3/:** who cooperates with anybody (ANY COUNTRY) if it brings profit /2/, and who respects his own interests /1/; **a person who has financial problems /6/:** who survives a crisis /1/, who suffers losses /3/, and who has to be frugal /2/; **a person who is getting out of trouble /1/:** who increases production /1/.

2. UKRAINE is A PERSON /27 ME/POLITICS (UKRAINE: 20 ME)

a person who created history /4/: who stood at the springhead of the river (EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION) /2/, and created the living space for others (EARLY EUROPEANS) /2/; **a person who reaps the bitter fruit sown in the past /1/:** bitter fruit (EXPERIENCE OF THE PREVIOUS 20 YEARS) [1]; **a person who has a heavy legacy /2/:** heavy legacy (POST-TOTALITARIAN SOCIETY, CORRUPTION) [1], the history of which should be finished /1/; **a person who is now independent and self-sustained /5/:** who is independent and may choose friends (OTHER COUNTRIES) /1/, who solves her own problems /1/, and defends her independence from the other person (RUSSIA) /3/; **a conscientious person /2/:** who fulfills the assumed obligations /2/; **who is problematic /2/:** who lives in several parallel worlds (PIECE, WAR, AND POLITICIANS' CAPITALIZING ON THE NATION) /1/, who creates artificial barriers, who is looking for a particular way and, as a result, slips into the abyss /1/; **a person whose importance is underestimated /4/:** who has not become attractive for the other person (EU) /1/; who considers herself to be important for the fate of the other person (EU) /1/ whom she protects/1/, which the other person (EU) doubts /1/.

ECONOMY (UKRAINE: 7 ME)

a sick person /5/: who is suffocating in a loop (TAXES) /1/; who is clogged in the tongs (ADMINISTRATIVE CORRUPTION), who is exhausted /2/, and who exhibits signs of life, with her half-ruined blood system (BANKS) and starvation (ABSENCE OF BANK CREDITS) /1/; **a person who is to be cured /2/:** who is to be cured /1/ with medications (INVESTMENTS) /1/.

3. EU is AN ASSISTANT;**UKRAINE is AN ASSISTED PERSON /82 ME/**POLITICS (EU—UKRAINE: 58 ME)

- **AN ASSISTED PERSON (UKRAINE) /3/ – who is in a tight corner /3/:** who needs assistance of others (EU, THE WEST) /1/, and who is waiting for help from an assistant (EU, MEMBER-STATES) /2/.
- **AN ASSISTANT (EU, MEMBER STATES) /55/ – who is concerned with the assisted person /3/:** who is interested in her (UKRAINE) /1/, who will benefit from her /1/, who has plans as to her /1/; **who helps the assisted person /49/:** who supports the assisted person (UKRAINE) /2/, encourages her to carry out reforms /1/, gives her a real helping hand /43/, tends to her more than she tends to herself /1/, who is a donor giving his blood (HELP) to the assisted person with the hope of mutual benefit /1/, and whose example should be followed by others (OTHER COUNTRIES) /1/; **who praises the assisted person /1/:** who applauds the assisted person (UKRAINE) for carrying out reforms /1/; **who is tired of the assisted person /2/:** who, being tired of the assisted person /1/, lingers with his support /1/.

ECONOMY (EU—UKRAINE: 24 ME)

- **AN ASSISTED PERSON (UKRAINE) /2/ – who asks for help /2/:** who keeps asking the assistant for money /2/.
- **AN ASSISTANT (EU, MEMBER-STATES) /22/ – who helps the assisted person /21/:** who gives her a real helping hand /21/, who is a donor giving his blood (FINANCIAL SUPPORT) to the assisted person /1/.

**4. EU is AN AUTHORITY;
UKRAINE is A SUBORDINATE /79 ME/
POLITICS (EU—UKRAINE: 79 ME)**

- **AN AUTHORITY (EU) /55/ – who cooperates with the subordinate /8/:** who assumes obligations as to the subordinate (UKRAINE) /1/, who shapes her worldview /1/, who is ready to wait for a positive response from the subordinate /1/; who closely watches the subordinate /2/, assesses her work /1/, approves of it /1/, and believes in the subordinate's success /1/; **who directs the subordinate's actions /7/:** who consults the subordinate (UKRAINIAN AUTHORITIES) /2/, supervises the subordinate (UKRAINIAN AUTHORITIES), controls her doings (UKRAINE'S POLITICS) /3/, induces and compels the subordinate to acts (INTRODUCE REFORMS) /2/; **who is demanding [15]:** who requires something (REFORMS, DEMOCRATIC RULE) of a subordinate /4/; who insists on the subordinate's fulfillment of her obligations to introduce reforms /11/; **who is tough with the subordinate /3/:** who puts pressure on the subordinate (UKRAINIAN AUTHORITIES) using an instrument (VISA-FREE TRAVEL FOR UKRAINE) /2/, and who is twisting the subordinate's arms /1/; **who exceeds his authority /1/:** who interferes in the subordinate's own life /1/; **who does not satisfy the subordinate's wishes /7/:** who refuses something (VISA-FREE TRAVEL), makes vague promises /6/, and ignores the subordinate's desires /1/; **who is dissatisfied with the subordinate /8/:** who is frustrated and annoyed by the subordinate (UKRAINIAN AUTHORITIES) because of her inertness (ABSENCE OR INEFFICIENCY OF REFORMS) /6/, and who criticizes the subordinate (UKRAINIAN AUTHORITIES) /2/; **who disrespects the subordinate /6/:** who treats the subordinate (UKRAINIAN AUTHORITIES) negatively /3/, disposes of the subordinate (UKRAINE) and mistreats her /1/.
- **A SUBORDINATE (UKRAINE) /24/ – who is attractive for the authority /1/:** who has always been attractive for the authority (EU) /1/; **who obeys the authority /10/:** who wants to please him /1/, who fulfills his tasks and requirements /8/, who pleads the authority to be softer /1/; **who wants to be like the authority /6/:** who tries to share his values /3/, but gets dissatisfied with them /1/, who senselessly tries to copy the authority /1/, and who is hard on those who disagree /1/; **who aspires for the authority's approval /4/:** who, having met the authority's requirements, is waiting for his concessions /4/; **who gets the authority's ambiguous assessment /2/:** who makes him both pleased and displeased /2/]; **who should not appease the authority in everything /1/:** who should not be afraid to violate the authority's comfort zone /1/.

**5. EU and UKRAINE are PARTNERS /17 ME/
POLITICS (EU—UKRAINE: 4 ME)**

- **A PARTNER (EU) /3/ – who is attractive /3/:** who is important for the other partner (UKRAINE) /2/, on whom the other partner (UKRAINE) should not turn her back /1/; **who is cooperated with /1/:** with whom the other partner (UKRAINE) has a dialogue /1/.
- ECONOMY (EU—UKRAINE: 13 ME)**
- **A PARTNER (EU) /12/ – who is attractive /3/:** who is important for the other partner (UKRAINE) /3/; **who is cooperated with /2/:** with whom the other partner (UKRAINE) cooperates /2/; **who is problematic /7/:** who is disadvantageous for the other partner (UKRAINE) /7/;
 - **A PARTNER (UKRAINE) /2/ – who is advantageous /1/:** who has a potential for cooperation with another partner (EU) /1/.

**6. EU and RUSSIA are PARTNERS (10 ME)
POLITICS (EU—RUSSIA: 10 ME)**

- **A PARTNER (EU, MEMBER-STATES) /10/ – who tolerates the other partner /8/:** who tries to maintain normal relations with the other partner (RUSSIA) /1/, who tries to understand the other partner /1/, who continues cooperation with her /6/; **who does not see a threat posed by the other partner /2/:** who is not afraid of the other partner /1/, who recklessly neglects the threats posed by the other partner /1/.

**7. RUSSIA is AN AGGRESSOR; UKRAINE is A VICTIM;
EU is THE VICTIM'S ALLY and THE AGGRESSOR'S ADVERSARY /97 ME/
POLITICS (EU—UKRAINE—RUSSIA: 97 ME)**

- **AN AGGRESSOR (RUSSIA) /8/ – who wages a war /5/:** who is at war with others (THE CIVILIZED WORLD) /2/, who fights for the prey (PEOPLE'S MINDS) /2/, who treats others (ITS OWN CITIZENS AND EUROPEANS) with poison (LIES) /1/; **who must be opposed /2/:** whose activities (SPREADING LIES) must be shut out /2/; **who has a weakness /1/:** who has a weakness (ECONOMY) /1/.
- **A VICTIM (UKRAINE) /14/ – the aggressor's victim /5/:** a person (UKRAINE) who together with others (MOLDOVA and GEORGIA) are victims of the aggressor (RUSSIA) /1/, who resists the aggressor /2/, who declares the aggressor's actions illegal /2/; **who withstands the aggressor's pressure /3/:** on whom the aggressor exerts pressure (MSLITARY OPERATIONS AND DIPLOMACY) /1/ held back with the life-saving equipment (MINSK AGREEMENTS) /1/ that is fragile /1/; **who suffers from the aggressor /3/:** who has been struck by the aggressor /1/, who has been inflicted heavy losses /1/, and who is in a post-shock state after the aggressor's attacks /1/; **who tries to overcome the aggressor /3/:** who repairs damages (AFTERMATHS OF THE HYBRID WAR) /1/, who looks for the ways to reach out to the seized territories (SEPARATIST REGIONS) /1/, and who asks for help from the assistant (OSCE) /1/.
- **THE VICTIM'S ALLY (EU) /8/ – who is influential /1/:** who influences the course of events /1/; **who assists the victim /7/** who helps the victim (UKRAINE) /2/, proposes her to conduct a dialogue with the aggressor (RUSSIA) /2/, and tries to save her and his own face at the negotiations with the aggressor /1/.
- **THE AGGRESSOR'S ADVERSARY (EU) /67/ – who condemns the aggressor /7/:** who condemns the aggressor's (RUSSIA'S) actions /4/, and demands their cessation /3/; **who fights with the aggressor /45/:** who exerts pressure on the aggressor /2/, uses weapons (SANCTIONS) /31/ that are self-destructive for the aggressor's adversary /7/ and therefore can be readily withdrawn /1/, which, however, may strengthen the aggressor and weaken her adversary /4/; **who has a weakness /1/:** who has a weakness (POLITICS) /1/; **who underestimates the aggressor's threats /9/:** who is not fully aware of the aggressor's danger /2/, who has to understand that the aggressor aspires to move the war (POLITICAL CONFRONTATION) to the adversary's territory /4/, to use a dangerous weapon (INTERFERENCE INTO DOMESTIC AFFAIRS OF THE EU MEMBER- STATES) against the adversary /2/, to contaminate the adversary's environment with viruses (SELF-DISCREDITING) as a bacteriological weapon /1/; **who must respond to the aggressor's threats /5/:** who demonstrates a weak response to the use of the aggressor's weapon (INTERFERENCE INTO DOMESTIC AFFAIRS OF THE EU MEMBER- STATES) /2/, who has finally started to defend himself against the aggressor /3/.

**8. EU is A FAMILY /43 ME/
POLITICS (EU: 35 ME)**

a family which is united /2/: which acts as a whole /1/, which must be integrated and strong /1/; **a family which has values /5/:** the family values of which (DEMOCRACY) /3/ are endangered by the actions of the old family members /1/, and not eagerly shared by all new family members (MIGRANTS, REGUGEES) /1/; **a family which is in crisis /6/:** which permanently survives crises and difficult times /1/, which has its own problems /3/, which cannot cope with some of these problems (TERRORISM, RADICAL MOODS) /2/; **a family the parents of which choose the wrong line of behavior /2/:** the parents (EU AUTHORITIES) of which give birth to unwanted children (THE RIGHT-WING POPULIST MOVEMENTS) /1/ who have food (MIGRATION CRISIS) to feed on /1/; **a family the members of which lack unity /6/:** the members of which (MEMBER-STATES) have stressed relations /1/, cannot achieve an agreement /2/, show discontent with something (SANCTIONS AGAINST RUSSIA, MIGRATION POLICY) /2/ and happen to be unable to take care of themselves, which makes the family suffer /1/; **a family one member of**

which intends to leave it /12/: a family member (BRITAIN) who is weary of being a donor for the others (OTHER MEMBER-STATES) /1/, who no longer wants to slave for the family /1/, who is eager to leave it ignoring the privileges granted by the family in exchange to obligations /3/, who has doubts as to leaving the family /2/, whose intention to leave worries the other family members /2/ that want the leaver to stay /3/; **a family which is important as a united team of players /2/:** on which the fan (THE USA) places a bet in the game (POLITICAL ACTIVITIES) /2/.

POLITICS (EU—UKRAINE: 5 ME)

a family which another family wants to join /3/: which another family (UKRAINE) wants to join as an equal member /2/, but acquires the status of a visitor so far /1/; **a family which does not want to feed a poor relative /2/:** which does not want to feed a poor relative (UKRAINE) /1/, who is late for the family dinner (ADMISSION OF THE NEW EU MEMBERS) /1/.

ECONOMY (EU: 3 ME)

a family which takes care of itself /1/: the interests of which have priority over the interests of family members (MEMBER-STATES) /1/; **a family which rules its members /2/:** which is dissatisfied with the state (ECONOMICS) of one of its members (ITALY) /1/, a family which is accused by one of its members (BRITAIN) of giving groundless preferences to the poorer family members (POORER EU COUNTRIES), as compared with the well-off family members (RICHER EU COUNTRIES) /1/.

9. EU is A BUILDING /50 ME/

POLITICS (EU: 40 ME)

a building which houses the dwellers /1/: in which the dwellers (EU MEMBER- STATES) should learn to live together /1/; **a building which is not safe /8/:** which may be ruined /1/, which is already being ruined /2/, the foundation of which has been cracked by one of the dwellers (GERMANY) /1/, which is being ruined by another dweller (BRITAIN) /2/, which can be ruined with an authorized mechanism (THE LEGAL RIGHT TO EXIT THE EU) employed by the dwellers /1/, a building which is seen by the observer (RUSSIA) as the one that is cracking and will soon fall apart /1/; **a building the future of which is unknown /4/:** which some of its dwellers (EUROSCEPTICS) want to dismantle /1/, which its managers (EU AUTHORITIES) want to save /2/, and which undergoes changes /1/; **a building which is left open /5/:** the doors of which are open for new dwellers (OTHER COUNTRIES) /2/, to where a new potential poor dweller (BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA) is on the way /1/, asking to let her in /2/; **a building from which one of its dweller wants to move out /5/:** the dweller (BRITAIN) who is not quite sure, however, whether she should do that /5/; **a building which gives shelter to the homeless /15/:** near the door of which there are millions of the homeless (REFUGEES AND MIGRANTS), who have come to the building by secret paths /1/, who are pleading for a shelter /3/, and who get it /2/, but then vandalize their new home, being neglected by its managers (EU AUTHORITIES) /1/ who now try to stop the newcomers by locking the building for the homeless /7/, and granting them temporary residence only in some parts of the building (IN SOME OF THE EU COUNTRIES) /1/; **a building in which the homeless may knock down a support /2/:** a support (THE EU CITIZENS' RIGHT TO FREE TRAVEL WITHIN THE EU) that may be knocked down by the homeless (REFUGEES AND MIGRANTS) /1/, and cause destruction of the building /1/.

POLITICS (EU—UKRAINE—RUSSIA: 3 ME)

a building which is threatened by the aggressor /3/: which is loosened, destabilized by the aggressor (RUSSIA) /2/, the supports of which (UNITY OF THE EU COUNTRIES, THE RULE OF LAW) are attempted to be ruined by the aggressor /1/.

ECONOMY (EU—UKRAINE: 7 ME)

a building which somebody wants to enter /3/: a building which is closed for a person (UKRAINE) /2/, and should be opened /1/; **a building which is opened for somebody /4/:** which

has opened its doors for a person (UKRAINE) /3/, which the person opens with a key (EU—UKRAINE AGREEMENT ON FREE TRADE) /1/.

**10. UKRAINE is A BUILDING /13 ME/
POLITICS (UKRAINE: 7 ME)**

a building which must have a solid foundation /2/: which lacks a solid foundation (DEMOCRACY) /1/, the foundation (DEMOCRACY) of which should be strong and stable /1/; **a building which is being built and remodeled /5/:** which the people who live in it (UKRAINIAN CITIZENS) build together, with the building's managers (UKRAINIAN AUTHORITIES) not involved /2/, which is being built according to the model of another building (EU) /1/, the building a part of which (UKRAINE'S HOME POLICY) is being built on the foundation (EUROPEAN PRINCIPLES AND LAWS) with the help of instruments (REGULATORY ACTS) /1/, and another part of which (UKRAINE'S FOREIGN POLICY) is being repaired and remodeled /1/.

POLITICS (EU—UKRAINE—RUSSIA: 2 ME)

a building which the aggressor attempts to ruin /2/: which the aggressor (RUSSIA) will keep shaking /1/, expecting that it will collapse, and its external defenders (EU, USA) will capitulate /1/.

ECONOMY (UKRAINE: 4 ME)

a building which is shaky /2/: which sinks due to one of its architects (NATIONAL BANK OF UKRAINE) /1/, which collapses because of the fall of its support (RAW MATERIAL PRICES) /1/; **a building which the aggressor attempts to ruin /1/:** which the aggressor (RUSSIA) attempts to ruin with weapons (SANCTIONS) /1/; **a building which should be built anew /1/:** which should be built anew according to the model prompted by the situation of crisis /1/.

**11. EU is A TERRITORY /47 ME/
POLITICS (EU: 9 ME)**

a territory which has external borders /2/: which has permeable borders /1/ with a barrier (TURKEY) that stops the newcomers /1/; **a territory which is being contaminated with poison [1]:** which is being thrived with poisonous mushrooms (ULTRA-RIGHT PARTIES) /1/; **a territory which is badly flooded /5/:** the flood (MIGRATION) that is dangerous /3/, that can cause a catastrophe /2/; **a territory which can be ruined /1/:** which can undergo tectonic changes due to a natural disaster (TERRORISM) /1/.

POLITICS (EU—UKRAINE: 3 ME)

a territory which somebody wants to enter /2/: which the person (UKRAINE) wants to enter /1/ through a bridge (LITHUANIA) /1/; **a territory which has values /1/:** from which the person (UKRAINE) wants to take out values (DEMOCRACY) /1/.

ECONOMY (EU—UKRAINE: 35 ME)

a territory which somebody enters /25/: to which the person (UKRAINE) is granted an access /3/, which is new for the person /1/, which the person enters, and on which she freely moves /21/; **a territory the access to which is important /5/:** a free access to which is important for the person - /5/; **the access to which is restricted /5/:** which is guarded by the owner (EU) from the other person (UKRAINE) /1/, the access to which requires observing regulations (EU RULES) /1/, and is limited for the person, who lacks funds /1/, and who has mostly one-way contacts with the territory /1/, the trust in which the person should regain /1/.

**12. UKRAINE is A TERRITORY /8 ME/
ECONOMY (EU—UKRAINE: 8 ME)**

a territory which joins the bigger territory /3/: which joins the bigger territory (EU ECONOMY / MARKET) /2/, remaining its outskirts /1/; **a territory which is open for the bigger territory /5/:** which is attractive for the bigger territory (EU ECONOMY / MARKET) /1/, opened for it /2/, and not safe from expansion of its goods /2/.

13. UKRAINE'S EUROPEAN INTEGRATION is A PATH /65ME/ POLITICS (EU—UKRAINE: 58 ME)

a path which had been taken by others [4]: which had been previously taken by other people (NEW MEMBER-STATES) /2/ who were helped by assistants (OLD MEMBER-STATES) /2/; **a path which has been chosen by the person /16/:** which has been chosen by the person (UKRAINE) who had got out of a swamp (POLITICAL UNCERTAINTY) /1/ and clearly defined the direction of her movement to the goal (EU) /6/, the path chosen instead of another path (EUROASIAN INTEGRATION) /1/, the path which the person has already had an intention to take /2/, the path which must be taken /1/, which somebody (ONE PART OF UKRAINE) wants and somebody (ANOTHER PART OF UKRAINE) does not want to take /2/, path-taking which the person (UKRAINIAN AUTHORITIES) demonstrates to somebody (THE WESTERN WORLD) /2/, path-taking which has a road map (UKRAINE—EU ASSOCIATION AGREEMENT) /1/; **a difficult path /2/:** the path which for the person (UKRAINE) may be long and thorny /2/; **a path on which the movement to the goal has already started /3/:** on which the person (UKRAINE) has started to actively move towards the goal (EU) /2/, being now only at the beginning of the path /1/; **a path by which the person moves forward /10/:** by which the person (UKRAINE) moves forward /4/ taking steps /DECOMMUNIZATION AND DESTALINIZATION, ADOPTION OF EUROPEAN NORMS, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF REFORMS) /4/, including the small ones (EVERYDAY CHANGES) /1/, and guided, because of her weakness, by the others (EU, USA, IMF) /1/; **a path which has milestones /1/:** the path which has milestones (CASES OF UKRAINE'S SUCCESS) /1/; **a path where the person's movement slows down /8/:** where the person's (UKRAINE's) movement slows down because of the obstacles (RESISTANCE OF BUSINESS CLANS, FOREIGN POLICY FACTORS, THE WAR IN DONBAS, VIOLATION OF DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN UKRAINE, INCOMPATIBILITY OF UKRAINIAN AND EUROPEAN STANDARDS) /5/, because the person takes undesirable directions (POLITICS IN DONBAS) /1/, staggers in one place, moves backward, and not forward /2/; **a path where the person's movement should be accelerated /2/:** where the person (UKRAINE) should accelerate her movement /1/ by changing the guide (UKRAINIAN AUTHORITIES) /1/; **a path which brings the person closer to the goal /9/:** the person (UKRAINE) who wants to feel closer to the goal (EU) /1/, who approaches the goal (COMPATIBILITY OF EU AND UKRAINIAN LEGISLATIONS) /4/, whose movement to the goal is now most successful /1/, with the light (VISA-FREE TRAVEL FOR UKRAINE) at the end of tunnel /1/, with the green light shown to the person by her assistant (EU) /1/ who gives her directions as to the further movement /1/; **a path which is correct /3/:** the path which has been correctly chosen by the person (UKRAINE) who is taking it /1/, and who cannot be stopped by the other person (RUSSIA), irrespective of the latter's desire /2/.

ECONOMY (EU—UKRAINE: 7 ME)

a new and perspective path /3/: which the person (UKRAINE) paves in new terrain (COOPERATION WITH NEW COUNTRIES) /1/, the path which brings the person (UKRAINE) to a higher level /1/ and closer to the goal (PROGRESS) /1/; **a difficult path which leads the person forward [2]:** on which the person (UKRAINE) has made steps /1/, being helped by other people (EU COUNTRIES) /1/; **a path on which the person slows down her movement /2/:** the movement which the person (UKRAINE) declares but practically not performs /1/, and which is being performed more successfully by another person (MOLDOVA) /1/.

14. Metaphorical capacity of the source concepts

The source concepts mapped upon the target metaphorical space, are: PERSON (with its variations – Person, Assistant, Assisted Person, Authority, Subordinate, Partner, Aggressor, Victim, Victim's Ally, and Aggressor's Adversary), FAMILY, BUILDING, TERRITORY and PATH. These sources have different degrees of metaphorical capacity shown in Table 5, which displays the expected highest metaphorical potential of personification. A noteworthy finding is that among the

PERSON'S roles the most conspicuous ones are Assistant, Aggressor's Adversary and Authority, all of which are associated with the European Union.

Table 5

Prominence of sources in salient conceptual metaphors

Metaphorical sources	Metaphorical targets	Number of ME	Total
1. PERSON			391
Person	EU (Politics, Economy) UKRAINE (Politics, Economy)	79 27	106
Assistant	EU (Politics, Economy)	77	77
Aggressor's adversary	EU (Politics)	67	67
Authority	EU (Politics)	55	55
Partner	EU (Politics, Economy) UKRAINE (Economy)	26 1	27
Subordinate	UKRAINE (Politics)	24	24
Victim	UKRAINE (Politics)	14	14
Victim's ally	EU (Politics)	8	8
Aggressor	RUSSIA (Politics)	8	8
Assisted person	UKRAINE (Politics, Economy)	5	5
2. PATH	UKRAINE'S EUROPEAN INTEGRATION (Politics, Economy)	65	65
3. BUILDING	EU (Politics, Economy) UKRAINE (Politics, Economy)	50 13	63
4. TERRITORY	EU (Politics, Economy) UKRAINE (Economy)	47 8	55
5. FAMILY	EU (Politics, Economy) UKRAINE (Politics)	42 1	43
			617

In the salient conceptual metaphors, the sources are most often mapped on such constituents of the target space as EU—UKRAINE, EU, and EU—RUSSIA (Table 6). On the whole, the actors involved in EU—Ukraine relations are metaphorically foregrounded in the following way (see the figures in Table 4): the EU – 452 ME (73, 3%), Ukraine – 157 ME (25,4%), and Russia – 8 ME (1,3%), which makes the EU the "key actor" on the metaphorical "stage" of Ukrainian media.

Table 6

Prominence of targets in salient conceptual metaphors

Targets	Number of ME	%
1. EU—UKRAINE	318	51,5
2. EU	157	25,4
3. EU—RUSSIA	80	13,0
4. UKRAINE	38	6,2
5. UKRAINE—RUSSIA	16	2,6
6. RUSSIA	8	1,3
	617	100

The prominence of "roles" played by the actors in EU—Ukraine relations is demonstrated in Table 7 that presents the number of ME for each source mapped upon a particular foregrounded target.

Table 7

Prominence sources mapped upon the targets in salient conceptual metaphors

Targets	Sources	Number of ME	Total
1. EUROPEAN UNION	PERSON	312	452 (73, 3%)
	Person	79	
	Assistant	77	
	Aggressor's adversary	67	
	Authority	55	
	Partner	26	
	BUILDING	50	
	TERRITORY	47	
	FAMILY	43	
2. UKRAINE	PERSON	71	92 (14,9%)
	Person	27	
	Subordinate	24	
	Victim	14	
	Assisted person	5	
	Partner	1	
	BUILDING	13	
	TERRITORY	8	
3. UKRAINE'S EUROPEAN INTEGRATION	PATH	65	65 (10,5%)
			157 (25,4%)
4. RUSSIA	PERSON	8	8 (1, 3%)
	Aggressor	8	
			617 (100%)

The findings given in Table 7 feature the typical metaphorical associations triggered by the targets, and vice versa. These associations become more precise, being supplied with the frequent extensions that elaborate the metaphorical schemas. The typical associations that construct the image of EU—UKRAINE RELATIONS are delivered in such conceptual metaphors:

- **EU is A PERSON** /79ME/: POLITICS – a powerful person who has authority and sets the agenda /22/, who has faults /9/, and who is differently treated by others (OTHER COUNTRIES) /6/; who is callous and unwilling to see the problems (POVERTY, PRISONERS OF WAR, AND BRUTALITIES IN DONBAS) of the other person (UKRAINE) /8/. ECONOMY – a person who has financial problems /6/. **EU is AN ASSISTANT** /77ME/: POLITICS – an assistant who helps the assisted person (UKRAINE), who gives her a real helping hand /49/. ECONOMY – an assistant who helps the assisted person (UKRAINE), who gives her a real helping hand /43/. **EU is THE AGGRESSOR'S ADVERSARY** /67 ME/: POLITICS – the aggressor's adversary who condemns the aggressor (RUSSIA) /7/, who fights with the aggressor using weapons (SANCTIONS) /45/, who underestimates the aggressor's threats /9/, who must respond to them /5/. **EU is AN AUTHORITY** /55 ME/ POLITICS – an authority who cooperates with the subordinate (UKRAINE) /8/: who directs the subordinate's actions /7/: who is demanding, and who insists on the subordinate's fulfillment of her obligations to introduce reforms /15/, who does not satisfy the subordinate's wishes /7/, who is dissatisfied with the subordinate /8/, who disregards her /6/. **EU is A PARTNER** /10 ME/: POLITICS – a partner who tolerates the other partner (RUSSIA) and continues cooperation with her /8/. ECONOMY – a partner who is problematic for another partner (UKRAINE) /7/.
- **EU is A BUILDING** /50 ME/: POLITICS – a building which is shaky and not safe /8/, which gives shelter to the homeless (REFUGEES AND MIGRANTS) who cause problems /15/.
- **EU is A TERRITORY** /47 ME/: ECONOMY – a territory which the person (UKRAINE) enters /25/, the access to which is important /5/ but restricted /5/.
- **EU is A FAMILY** /43 ME/: POLITICS – a family which is in crisis /6/, the members of which (MEMBER-STATES) lack unity /6/, with one member (BRITAIN) intending to leave her relatives /12/.
- **UKRAINE is A PERSON** /27 ME/: POLITICS – a person who created history /4/, who is now independent and self-sustained /5/, whose importance is underestimated /4/. ECONOMY – a sick person /5/.
- **UKRAINE is A SUBORDINATE** /24 ME/: POLITICS – a subordinate who obeys the authority (EU) /10/, who wants to be like the authority /6/, who aspires for the authority's approval /4/.
- **UKRAINE is A VICTIM** /14 ME/: POLITICS – a victim of the aggressor (RUSSIA) /5/.
- **UKRAINE is A BUILDING** /13 ME/: POLITICS – a building which is being built and remodeled /5/.
- **UKRAINE'S EUROPEAN INTEGRATION is A PATH** /65ME/ POLITICS – a path which has been chosen by the person (UKRAINE) /16/, by which the person moves forward /10/, on which the person's movement slows down /8/, which brings the person closer to the goal (EU) /9/.
- **RUSSIA is AN AGGRESSOR** /8 ME/ – POLITICS – an aggressor who wages a war against others (UKRAINE AND THE WORLD) /5/.

Concluding discussion

This study of ME employed by Ukrainian popular newspapers in the first half of 2016 has enabled exposure of the system of conceptual metaphors that represent Ukraine—EU relations that develop against the background of Russia—Ukraine confrontation. As a system, the reconstructed conceptual metaphors form an intertextual "meta-narrative" with its referential and relational coherence.

In the target metaphorical space, referential coherence is provided by iteration of the referents – the EU, Ukraine and Russia; and relational coherence is realized through the links between them. In the source metaphorical space, referential is created through iteration of a limited number of source concepts evolving in-depth. Their relations render the image which is easily recognizable by the human mind: *"There are PERSONS (who belong to three FAMILIES) who live in their own BUILDINGS located on some TERRITORIES. One of these persons wants to get rid of the influence of the Eastern neighbor and takes the PATH which leads to the territory of the Western neighbor who sympathizes with the person and helps her. The Eastern neighbor gets infuriated and starts to exert pressure on the traveler, so as to make her stop and go back"*. This naïve image, typical of everyday life, overlaps with the cultural image entrenched in Ukrainians' mentality:

...whilst the West is freedom, aspiration for sovereignty, and the rule of law, the East (including the Eastern Europe) is tyranny, acquiescence, and submission to despotism; whilst the West is dynamics, activity, and development; the East is inaction and stagnation; the West is logical thinking and rational institutions, and the East is illogical thinking and traditional institutions; in the West reason governs emotions, while in the East emotions are the king; finally, the West is an incarnation of masculinity, and the East incarnates femininity. These identities are accounted for rather by post-colonial than geographical space [Yavorska and Bogomolov 2010: 37] (the translation is mine – S.Z.).

The coherent schematic image maintained in the source metaphorical space serves as a "sketch" for the metaphorical narrative "canvas" and makes it easy to read. The system of sources imposes the referents' roles and explains who is who. The metaphorical narrative about Ukraine—EU relations, being relatively invariable due to the system of source concepts entrenched in the languages of politics, may, however, undergo diachronic and synchronic changes.

Diachronic changes of the metaphorical system depicting Ukraine—EU relations become evident when the findings of this research are compared with the findings of a similar study [Yavorska and Bogomolov 2010] aimed to reconstruct the system of conceptual metaphors employed by Ukrainian press for portraying the relations between Ukraine and Europe in 2001-2007. Then, Ukrainian media featured *Europe* as a well-off PERSON with ambivalent traits [ibid: 58], as a Teacher who controls the Student (Ukraine) [ibid: 58], as an Authority who superintends the Subordinate (Ukraine) [ibid: 62], and as a FAMILY that has old and new members [ibid: 58]. *Ukraine's integration with Europe* was described as a JOURNEY where the emphasis was placed on the initial stage of this journey, and the identified direction of the route [ibid: 80-84]. *Russia* was presented as a dangerous and aggressive PERSON whose irritation the West tries to avoid [ibid: 80-84].

In the respective conceptual metaphors of 2016, their general schemas are maintained, but their elaboration is different. *Europe (the EU)* has become a much more agreeable PERSON who is Ukraine's Assistant and Partner, and whose function of the Authority is less annoying. In the data of 2016, the metaphor Teacher-Student is practically absent; it is represented only in 2 ME, where Ukraine, as a Student, does her home assignment and gets the grades from the Teacher. The image of the EU as a FAMILY acquires new details concerned with the stressed relations between the EU Member-States, and the migration crisis. The concept of the PATH (analogous to JOURNEY), mapped upon *Ukraine's integration with Europe*, retains prominence of the same ideas of the chosen route, and (slowly) moving ahead. This movement, however, becomes more goal-oriented and defined with regard to its means. Russia's image as an Aggressive person grows into an Aggressor who wages a real war.

Synchronic changes of the metaphorical system portraying Ukraine—EU relations may be caused by the change of the narrator, which is obvious from the study of Chaban and Elgström contributed to this Special Issue. The authors consider the conceptual metaphors that shape perceptions of the EU—Ukraine relations from the standpoint of the EU. The ME, obtained from the EU official documents and interviews with the EU practitioners dealing with Ukraine, expose

the roles of the EU as a capable PERSON, NURTURER, CATALYSER, skilful ARCHITECT / CONSTRUCTOR, attractive, non-imposing and committed PARTNER / COMPANION, supporting, caring, imposing and dictating AUTHORITY and TEACHER. Russia is painted as a CHALLENGER to the EU's security and as a FORCE / IMPACT that destabilizes Ukraine. These roles, which partially overlap with those tracked in Ukrainian newspapers, demonstrate a partial mismatch in the perceptions of the EU by "Self" and "Others".

The above brief outline of similarities and differences in in the systems of conceptual metaphors creating the image of UKRAINE—EU RELATIONS may be developed into an autonomous study that deserves its own publication. The key issue of the present study – the methodology for analysing a system of conceptual metaphors tracked in multiple linguistic data obtained from thematically homogeneous texts – has obvious implications for a comparative study of variable political images that serve as a latent foundation for shaping ideologies and directing decision-making in politics. The results of this study may be of particular interest to the EU practitioners who deal with Ukraine, and whose image of UKRAINE—EU RELATIONS turns out to be somewhat different from this image possessed by the other party.

REFERENCES

- Bartlett, F.C. (1932). *Remembering*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Brovchenko, I. V. (2011). *Kontseptualnaya metafora v klishe angloyazychnogo nauchnogo teksta [Conceptual metaphor in the collocations of English scholarly texts]*. Unpublished candidate dissertation, Bohdan Khmel'nitsky National University of Cherkasy, Ukraine (in Ukrainian).
- Chaban, N. and Bain, J. (2014). Framing the EU in a time of crisis: media reflections from EU 'strategic' partners in Asia-Pacific. In N. Chaban and M. Holland (eds.). *Communicating Europe in times of crisis*. The European Union in International Affairs Series. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 118–142.
- Chomsky N. *Language and politics*. 2nd ed. (2004). Edinburgh et al.: AK Press, 2004.
- C³EU (*Crisis, Conflict and Critical Diplomacy: EU Perceptions in Ukraine, Israel and Palestine*), Available from: <https://jeanmonnet.nz/c3eu/>.
- Dijk van T.A. (1998). *Making news: a study in the construction of reality*. New York: Free Press.
- Evans V. and Green M. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics. An introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Feldman, J.A. (2008). *From molecule to metaphor*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: The MIT Press.
- Fisher, G. (1997). *Mindsets: The role of culture and perception in international relations*, 2nd ed. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.
- Goatly, A. (1997). *The language of metaphors*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Herrmann, R.K. (2013). *Perception and image theory in international relations*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Herrmann, R. K., Voss, J. F., Schooler, T. Y. E., and Ciarrichi, J., (1997). Images in international relations: an experimental test of cognitive schemata. *International studies quarterly*, 41, 403–433.
- Katz, A.N. (1998). Figurative language and figurative thought: A review. In A.N. Katz, C. Cacciari, R.W. Gibbs, Jr. and M. Turner. *Figurative language and thought*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kemmer, S. (2003). Schemas and lexical blends. In H. Cuyckens, T. Berg, R. Dirven, and Klaus-Uwe P. *Motivation in language: Studies in honor of Günter Radden*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 69-97.
- Kövecses, Z. (2000). The scope of metaphor. In A. Barcelona (ed.). *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: A cognitive perspective*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 79-92.
- Kövecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor. A practical introduction*. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.

- Kövecses, Z. (2018). Metaphor in media language and cognition: A perspective from Conceptual Metaphor Theory. *Lege Artis*, 1 (3), 124-140. DOI: 10.2478/lart-2018-0004
- Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive grammar. A basic introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff G. (1993). Contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (ed.). *Metaphor and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 202–251.
- Lakoff, G. (1991). The metaphor system used to justify war in the Gulf. *Journal of Urban and Cultural Studies* 2(1), 59-72.
- Lakoff, G. (2002), *Moral politics. How Liberals and Conservatives think*, Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2008), *The political mind: Why you can't understand 21st-century American politics with an 18th-century brain*, New York: Penguin Group.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Movahedi, S. (1985). The social psychology and the politics of international images. *Human affairs*, 8, 1–11.
- Radchenko O.Y. (2012). *Kontseptual'na metafora v terminosystemi marketynhu [Conceptual metaphor in the terminological system of marketing]*. Unpublished candidate dissertation, Bohdan Khmel'nitsky National University of Cherkasy, Ukraine (in Ukrainian).
- Sadri, H. and Flammia, M. (2014). Democracy, political perceptions, and new media. *Systemic, Cybernetics and Informatics*, 3 (12), 29-33.
- Supriadi, L. (2017) A study of conceptual metaphor in a political discourse. *International Journal of Management and Applied Science (IJMAS)*, 5 (3), 6-10.
- Wodak, R. (2011) *The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual*. 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, R. and Forchtner, B. (eds.) (2017). *The Routledge handbook of language and politics*. London: Routledge.
- Yavorska, H. and Bohomolov, O. (2010). *Nepevnyi obyekt bazhannya: Yevropa v ukrayins'komu politychnomu dyskursi [An uncertain object of desire: Europe in Ukrainian Political Discourse]*. (In Ukrainian). Kyiv: Dmytro Burago Publishing House, A. Krymskyi Institute of Oriental Studies of the National Academy of Sciences, Ukraine.
- Zhabotynskaya, S. A. (2013a) Kontseptualnaya metafora v spetsialnom yazyike: protsedura analiza [Conceptual metaphor in the language for specific purposes: a research procedure]. (In Russian). *Inostrannyye yazyiki v vysshney shkole. (Ryazanskiy gos. un-t imeni S.A. Esenina)*, 3 (26), 24-32.
- Zhabotynskaya, S. A. (2013b) Kontseptualnaya metafora: kongruentnoe i nekongruentnoe kartirovanie vo mnozhestvennykh dannykh [Conceptual metaphor: congruent and incongruent mapping in multiple data]. (In Russian). *Funktsionalnaya lingvistika (Simferopol)*, 5, 104–106.
- Zhabotynska, S. (2013c). Saussure's theory of the linguistic sign: a cognitive perspective. In: *Papers of the International Congress of Linguistics*, 20-27 July, 2013, Geneva [online]. Available from: http://www.cil19.org/uploads/documents/Saussure_Theory_Of_The_Linguistic_Sign-A_Cognitive_Perspective.pdf
- Zhabotynskaya, S. A. (2016). Kontseptualnyie metaforyi v rechah Baraka Obamyi i Vladimira Putina (2014–2015) [Conceptual metaphors in the public speeches of Barack Obama and Vladimir Putin (2014–2015)]. (In Russian). *Cognition, communication, discourse*, 13, 43-91. Available from: <https://sites.google.com/site/cognitiondiscourse/vypusk-no13-2016/zabotinskaa-s-a>

Zhabotynskaya, S. A. (2017). Narrativnyie politicheskie kontseptyi: metodika lingvokognitivnogo analiza [Narrative political concepts: methods of cognitive linguistic analysis]. (In Russian). In N. V. Petluchenko (ed.). *Kontseptyi i kontrastyi*. Odessa: Izdatelskiy dom "Gelvetika", 30-40.

Svitlana Zhabotynska – Doctor of Linguistics, Professor, School of Foreign Languages, Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy (81 Shevchenko Blvd., Cherkasy 18031, Ukraine); e-mail: saz9@ukr.net; ORCID: 0000-0001-9841-6335

Світлана Жаботинська – доктор філол. наук, професор, Навчально-науковий інститут іноземних мов, Черкаський національний університет імені Богдана Хмельницького (Бульвар Шевченка, 81, Черкаси 18031, Україна); e-mail: saz9@ukr.net; ORCID: 0000-0001-9841-6335

Светлана Жаботинская – доктор филол. наук, профессор, Учебно-научный институт иностранных языков, Черкасский национальный университет имени Богдана Хмельницкого (Бульвар Шевченко, 81, Черкасы 18032, Украина); e-mail: saz9@ukr.net; ORCID: 0000-0001-9841-6335