

Linguistics and languages (UDC 81)

DOI: 10.18454/RULB.4.14

Циркунова С.А.

Московский государственный институт международных отношений (Университет) МИД России
**УКРАИНСКИЙ КОНФЛИКТ В ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ США И ВЕЛИКОБРИТАНИИ ЧЕРЕЗ ПРИЗМУ
 МЕТАФОРИЧЕСКОГО МОДЕЛИРОВАНИЯ (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ ОНЛАЙН ИЗДАНИЙ)**

Аннотация

В статье рассматриваются способы метафорического моделирования внешней политики США в рамках украинского конфликта. Концептуальная система презентации данного конфликта, используемая онлайн изданиями США и Великобритании, не вполне соответствует широко известной системе концептуальных метафор Дж. Лакоффа. В статье рассматриваются возможные причины данного несоответствия.

Ключевые слова: политический дискурс, концептуальная метафора, метафорическое моделирование.

Tsirkunova S.A.

MGIMO-University

**“WHY SHOULD WE CARE?” A METAPHORICAL ANALYSIS OF US AND UK POLITICAL DISCOURSE ON THE
 UKRAINE CRISIS IN ONLINE MEDIA**

Abstract

This article presents a framework for the linguistic analysis of political discourse, offering some insight into how the online press currently determines the worldview of their readers. Drawing on critical discourse analysis and conceptual metaphor theory, we consider how the metaphorical models, offered by G. Lakoff for decoding the US foreign policy, can be applied to analyse patterns of metaphorical representation used to construct the political reality of foreign policy, required by the US interest groups. This paper argues that this metaphorical system is incomplete for conceptualising US policy in the Ukraine conflict, and claims that the cognitive model is determined by the context in which it is used and, consequently, by the perspective adopted.

Keywords: political discourse, conceptual metaphor, critical discourse analysis.

Introduction

Representation of the Ukraine conflict in the mass media offers a fertile field of study for critical discourse analysis through the prism of conceptual metaphor. This paper sets up a framework for language analysis of the role of metaphor in presenting the picture of unrest in the Ukraine. As metaphor is seen by cognitive linguistics as an effective means of decoding deep-seated ways of thinking, identifying the metaphorical patterns, used in news reports and opinion pieces of the online press in the US and the UK, allows for the separation of reality from reality as – described, or from reality constructed by the mass media to maintain ideological control.

The answer to the question raised in the US press, “Why the US should care about Ukraine?” (<http://www.forbes.com/sites/katyasoldak/2013/12/02/why-the-u-s-should-care-about-ukraine/>) is not obvious. In theory, the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security is borne by the United Nations Security Council.

“The Security Council takes the lead in determining the existence of a threat to the peace or act of aggression... In some cases, the Security Council can resort to imposing sanctions or even authorize the use of force to maintain or restore international peace and security” (<http://www.un.org/en/sc/>).

In reality, the three rounds of sanctions imposed on Russia have nothing to do with the Security Council. “On March 6, 2014, President Obama signed Executive Order 13660 that authorizes sanctions on individuals and entities responsible for violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, or for stealing the assets of the Ukrainian people” (<http://www.state.gov/e/eb/tfs/spi/ukrainerrussia/>). The first round of the sanctions, as well as the next two, were initiated by the US government. The question of whether this decision can be regarded as a violation of international law is not an objective of this study. Our aim is to use conceptual metaphor to identify the values that underpin the answer to the question, “Why should we care?” (<http://fortenberry.house.gov/media-center/fort-reports/fort-report-ukraine-why-should-we-care/>).

An inherent part of any international conflict is information warfare that aims at manipulating the public and the opponents. Thus, Resolution 758, adopted by US Congress declaring the economic and information war against Russia, states that

“the House of Representatives calls on the President and the United States Department of State to develop a strategy for multilateral coordination to produce or otherwise procure and distribute news and information in the Russian language to countries with significant Russian-speaking populations which maximizes the use of existing platforms for content delivery ...”

(<https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/house-resolution/758/text>).

This kind of “strategy to produce, procure and distribute news and information” (ibid.) could provide the grounds for justification of the policy followed by the government by changing the way people think. Our language shapes the way we think, which reflects the ability of linguistic units to encode a particular conceptualisation of the situation or event which, when decoded, may influence the way we perceive this situation or event. Ideological stereotypes are created, reproduced, and imposed by the languages we speak.

Literature Review

Political discourse on mass media is rich in metaphors. The choice of metaphors is determined by various factors, from purely decorative rhetoric to ideological stance. The political discourse of the online press in presenting the conflict in the Ukraine is no exception. The focus of this paper is to identify the metaphorical models used to portray the international policy of the USA, to explain the metaphorical patterns and effects they generate, and to describe what these patterns may reveal about the values underpinning and informing this policy.

The method of detection of naturalised ideological stereotypes or patterns was presented via Conceptual Metaphor Analysis (CMA) in Lakoff and Johnson’s “*Metaphors We Live By*” (Lakoff, 1980;2003). Drawing upon the cognitive approach in linguistics and critical discourse analysis, CMA provides a lens for decoding the underlying meaning of linguistic units. This view is based on the claim that any situation can be conceptualised in a variety of ways, but the linguistic units of each will necessarily encode a particular pattern of thought.

CMA offers a theoretical framework for the identification and classification of metaphorical expressions. As “our ordinary conceptual system is fundamentally metaphorical in nature” (ibid. p. 3) and “the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (ibid. p. 5), in the process of conceptualisation, new and difficult abstract phenomena are structured by easier and more familiar ones. Thus, any “metaphorical concept” (ibid. p. 6) implies that a complicated target domain is conceptualised in terms of a familiar source domain. In other terms, it is a mapping of correspondences across various conceptual domains (Kovecses, 2002, p.5).

Andrew Goatly claimed that our conceptualisation and, consequently, our actions are unconsciously biased to serve the interests of established power (Goatly, 2007). His crucial contention is that the reconstruction of metaphorical patterns allows for the decoding of latent ideologies that affect personal, social and political behaviour (ibid. pp.25-30).

The role of metaphor in creating and reproducing ideological stereotypes is decisive. T. van Dijk claimed that ideological stereotypes, such as ethnic inequality or group dominance are a form of power abuse, and media discourse is one of the most effective means of its reproduction (van Dijk, 2006).

The application of CMA to the understanding of US foreign policy was suggested by G. Lakoff (Lakoff, 2004). He argued that US policy is structured by a worldview based on the model "world as community". Within this community, there are "nations-persons" maintaining social relationships, including neighbours and friends, enemies and rogue states. Military force is necessary to "police" the community. The "maturity as industrialisation" metaphor allows for the division of "nation – adult"/"nation – child". This division is associated with the "strict father" model, which is informed by traditional conservative values whereby supporting this moral system is the highest value, and the "strict father" must teach his children right from wrong (Lakoff, 1996/2002). The aim of this paper is to identify the role assigned to Russia within this conceptual system, and to consider its implications for international relations.

Data and Methodology.

The objective of this study is to identify the most productive metaphorical models used to present the US political engagement in the conflict over the Ukraine in the American and British online press. The analysis of these models allows for the construal of hidden ideology.

First, a small-scale corpus of texts on the topic under study, which comprises approximately 30 000 words, was constructed. As this approach allows for a manual search of the most productive metaphors in the corpus, it is often adopted in the studies within the framework of discourse analysis and CMA (Charteris-Black and Musolff, 2003; Burnes, 2011), which is why this approach has been used to achieve the above-mentioned objective of this study.

The corpus of texts consists of online media reports, as "media combine reasoned persuasion with emotional appeal. Both of them incorporate culturally entrenched cognitive models and conceptualised personal, social and cultural experiences" (Charteris-Black, 2011, p. 21). The texts were extracted from the websites of the Financial Times, the Washington Post, the Daily Beast, the New York Times, Forbes, the USA Today, the Washington Times, the Guardian, and the Daily Mail. Both commentary and reporting articles presenting US foreign policy in the Ukraine were examined to identify the most common metaphorical models without addressing the issue of culture-specific differences between American and British patterns of metaphorical expressions.

The identification of metaphorical expressions was based on the procedure developed by the Pragglejaz group, MIP (PG, 2007). It is an explicit and reliable method for the identification of metaphorical expressions in a text. The mechanism requires determining the contextual meaning of a linguistic unit in the text, and then ascertaining whether this unit has a more basic contemporary meaning (that is, more concrete, related to bodily action, more precise, or historically older). The lexical unit can be marked as metaphorical if its contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning, but can be understood in comparison with it (ibid. p. 3).

An example is "The goal of U.S. policy vis-a-vis Russia appears to be to increase the economic pain until President Vladimir Putin backs down" (Washington Post 07.08.2014).

The word *pain* means "highly unpleasant physical sensation caused by illness or injury; mental suffering or distress" (<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com>). In this context, the noun describes the deterioration of the economy as a result of the measures aimed at weakening it. Thus, as the contextual meaning "contrasts with the basic meaning and can be understood in comparison with it" (PG, 2007, p.3), it can be marked as metaphorical.

The texts on the topic under study were extracted from the websites and kept in Scribble Library. They were analysed and the metaphorical meanings of the linguistic units were identified by following the MIP procedure. Then the identified metaphorical expressions were then coded according to the underlying conceptual metaphors to decode latent ideological values.

Results

The way in which people and even nations act in a given situation is determined by the way the particular situation is understood. However, as we do not have direct access to our

conceptualisation system, the importance of the mechanism for decoding this system, provided by cognitive linguistics and by CMA in particular, cannot be overestimated. Thus, analysis of the way in which the foreign policy is understood by Americans may shed light on the way why this policy is pursued.

This study has shown that the most common conceptual metaphor used in the online press is "world as community", which implies the existence of neighbours, friends and enemies. According to G. Lakoff, this metaphor is always used to justify the US involvement in a conflict. International relations are perceived as social relationships that need protection, which should always be taken into account by its members:

1) And the European Union will stand by its neighbours and partners. (The Guardian, 29.07.2014)

2) It sets the table for the new Congress to mandate secondary sanctions on Russia that will create a serious rift with the Europeans... (The Financial Times, 16.12.14).

As a community, nations may demonstrate disapproval of what is perceived of as anti-social behaviour:

3) ...a Russian Davos that was shunned by many western business leaders. (The Guardian, 29.07.14)

4) Russia is becoming more isolated on the world stage, although Putin said any Western attempts to impose a new Iron Curtain would fail. (The Washington Post, 23.11.14)

An inherent frame here is "nation as person"; an example is "Then, as now, a strongman in the Kremlin acted recklessly" (the Washington Post, 07.08.2014).

"It is part of an international community metaphor, in which there are friendly nations, hostile nations, rogue states, and so on" (Lakoff, 2004, p.69) This metaphor provides justification for the involvement in conflicts, as Americans are told that the war is not waged against people, but only against this person [ibid. p. 69].

The members of this community have their individual interests, but following these interests may not be approved of by other members:

5) On occasion, when the U.S. government has been unable to convince other countries to join it in imposing sanctions on a targeted entity, the U.S. Congress has legislated "secondary" sanctions which call on the American government to penalize a third country or company when it engages in activities the United States would like to be prohibited. (The Daily Beast, 13.05.14)

When the interests of the members do not coincide, or when they clash, tensions may arise:

6) America's effort to use its economic might where its diplomatic arguments had not been persuasive infuriated the Europeans, leading to open diplomatic fissures and a crisis in the trans-Atlantic relationship. (The Daily Beast, 13.05.14)

There is no equality in this community, as some members seem to be superior to others. According to Lakoff, the international community is populated by nations – adults and nations – children. The level of "maturity" determines their standing in the society. Superpowers acquire the right to teach and discipline "developing" nations:

7) We will either have World War III or the collapse of the United States as a credible superpower and an era of chaos. (Forbes, 01.09.2014)

8) With the American economy currently outperforming those of Europe and Japan, Mr. Obama came into this meeting with a stronger hand than he has had in past meetings. (The New York Times, 17.11.14)

One of the most effective tools used in the process of "teaching" is sanctions. Sanctions are considered to be an efficient means of punishment:

9) Sanctions are a tool, not a strategy. Like military force, diplomacy, and economic assistance, sanctions need to be coupled with other tools to form a cohesive strategy. (The Daily Beast, 13.05.14)

The "sanctions as punishment" metaphor implies that Russia deserves punishment for its behaviour:

10) The potential Congressional sanctions, however, seem to have kicked Moscow into action. (The Guardian, 15.12.2014)

The sanctions may be metaphorically presented as corporal punishment, intended to inflict pain:

11) The goal of U.S. policy vis-a-vis Russia appears to be to increase the economic pain until President Vladimir Putin backs down. (The Washington post, 07.08.2014)

12) Putin appeared to be trying to strike a note of confidence while Western sanctions against Russia's financial and energy sectors were increasingly biting the economy. (Washington post, 23.11.2014)

13) Rep. Adam Schiff... called the sanctions an "important step" but said ultimately Obama will have to hit key Russian business sectors for Putin to feel real pain. (USA Today, 28.04.14)

According to Lakoff, a nation – adult can teach and discipline any nation – child if it misbehaves. The dominant value that should be fostered by the community is "moral strength".

NATO Chief to Putin: "Don't test us." (The Daily Beast, 16.09.14).

In these terms, Russia must be perceived as a nation – child, but this study reveals a different image of the country in the online media:

14) Russia is still–feels itself in its bones–the humiliated loser of the Cold War. Great Powers are wise to be magnanimous with other Great Powers, because they never stay weak for long. 01.09.2014 Forbes

15) The empire wants its groove back. (Forbes, 24.11.2014)

16) To expect Russia to sit on its hands while Ukraine moors itself in the Western bloc is ideologically-motivated delusion of the same order as any irredentist fantasia. (Forbes, 01.09.2014)

17) But Russia is no such thing, just a major regional power sick of being humiliated and pushed around by ignorant outsiders. (The Daily Mail, 02.03.14)

These examples present Russia as a nation — person, a great power which, after the dissolution of the Soviet Union and faced with difficult economic times, is struggling to return to its former status. This image of Russia has nothing to do with the role of a nation-child that needs to be taught right from wrong; instead, it can be defined in terms of the nation – rival metaphor that is absent from the metaphorical system, offered by G. Lakoff:

18) US and Russia in danger of returning to era of nuclear rivalry. (The Guardian, 04.01.15)

19) ... we are facing a period of "deepening military competition". (The Guardian, 01.15.14)

20) The Kremlin is certainly behaving as if it has nothing to fear from the United States or European Union. (The Washington Post, 25.11.14)

21) U.S. officials, lawmakers, and experts, have been watching and waiting for Putin to use the Iran negotiations as a way to mess with Obama ever since the tit-for-tat sanctions began in March. (The Daily Beas, 18.07.14)

22) But the decision for the Pentagon to freeze the U.S. relationship with Russia undermines key U.S. policy for years to strengthen ties with its Cold War adversary.(The Daily Beast, 03.03.14)

This nation –rival metaphor presents the conflict over the Ukraine in a different light; in other words, the sanctions – punishment metaphor can no longer reproduce the USA's image as the "strict father of a backward child". The term sanctions as punishment imposed by the rival – state acquires a new meaning that is supported by another productive metaphorical modal, "international affairs as war":

1) The shooting down of MH17 has escalated the diplomatic war between Washington and Moscow and made that scenario more likely because it could result in more sanctions and legal action against the Russian government. (The Daily Beast, 18.07.14)

2) Russia is preparing to hit back at fresh EU sanctions with a new list placing embargos on imports of consumer goods and secondhand cars from western countries, deepening a tit-for-tat trade war sparked by the crisis in Ukraine. (The Guardian, 11.09.14)

According to G. Lakoff , this model is always used to present a picture of a just war. This scenario typically involves such characters as a villain, a victim and a hero. In the present conflict, the Ukraine is assigned the role of a victim, while Russia is described as a criminal:

3) Tens of thousands vote in regional referendum dubbed 'a criminal farce organised by Russia'.

4) Ukrainian government officials say they believe the Russian forces and their puppet allies may be preparing a major offensive to capture more territory. (Washington Post, 25.11.14)

5) Crimea matters, they say, because it throws into disarray the European map that was settled following decades of conflict during the Cold War in which the Soviet Union terrorized Eastern Europe. (The USA Today, 24.04.2014)

This "just war" has been declared by the US and its allies, performing the role of the hero:

6) The Obama administration had been keen to avoid new sanctions legislation because they feared it could damage the unified front the US has managed to construct over Ukraine with the EU. (The Financial Times, 16.12.2014)

The victims here are the Ukraine and some other post-Soviet states:

7) ...the sanctions in place today have little hope of reversing Russian aggressive or curbing Putin's drive to re-establish Russian dominance of the country's "near abroad." (The Daily Beast, 13.05 14)

One more metaphorical model revealed by this study is "foreign policy is a game of chess" with its players, strategies, moves and outcomes:

1) The geopolitical chessboard seems to cry out for bold new moves. (The Financial Times, 08.12.2014)

2) There are "grandmasters in this world", some of them are "pursuing a game plan, that could be called the new Yalta defense", others are "ready for a classical deployment of the Perfidious Albion counter-attack", and "transform the game with a new and unexpected gambit" or are "liable to find that the pawns have started moving around on their own". (The Financial Times, 08.12.2014)

Conclusions

The conceptual models provided by the American and the British online press appear to be quite conventional at first glance. Three metaphorical models prevail in the current political discourse devoted to the unrest in Ukraine.

The most productive model in the material under study is "world as community". The community is described as recognising its moral norms, one of which is "moral strength". This metaphor is described by Lakoff in *Moral Politics* as a part of the "strict father" family model, presenting the world community as a family. Just as the strict father is responsible for teaching his family right from wrong, by disciplining and punishing his children, the industrialised nations dictate to and teach the nonindustrialised, the Third World nations. As the "sanctions as punishment" metaphor seems to be in line with this model, a question may arise here, however, concerning the role of Russia in this story. Numerous metaphorical expressions portray Russia as a rival state rather than as a Third World country, or as a "backward child". Example include "Russia is no longer a defeated power of the Cold War era", and "it's against our interests geopolitically to let Russia feel that they all of a sudden have won all the turf without firing a shot" (Washington Times 24.11.14). This portrayal is predominantly negative, reflecting that the prospect of restoring a bipolar world is viewed as highly undesirable. In this case the "strict father" metaphor is not productive, and is replaced by the "long-standing rival" model. Thus, the world community metaphor implies that, in addition to the nation – adult and nation – child models, there are also nations – rivals who compete: "The Kremlin is certainly behaving as if it has nothing to fear from the United States or European Union" (Washington post 25.11.15). The metaphor "nation as person" is extended by the metaphor "national interest", according to which "strength is military force":

"However, the new aggressive tone coincides with an extensive upgrading of Russia's nuclear weapons, reflecting Moscow's renewed determination to keep pace with the US arsenal" (The Guardian 01.01.15).

Thus, the metaphorical model provided by G. Lakoff, seems to be incomplete with regard to conceptualising the US foreign policy in the conflict over the Ukraine. The metaphor "nation as rival" revealed by this study is used by online media to portray the state of affairs in the community. According to this view, another productive source domain identified by this study, "war", can be seen as supportive of the rival model.

The source domain "war" has traditionally been used in American political discourse to justify the government's policy during various conflicts. The source domain implies the

manifestation of physical power, a straightforward competition between its winners and losers. This “war” is presented as a struggle between the forces of reason and the forces of irrationality. The forces of reason, the USA and the EU, have to resist the irrational actor, Russia, which is “terrorising” the Ukraine and other post-Soviet states. This war has broken out on diplomatic, trade, and ideological fronts. Within this model, sanctions are perceived as weapons. This “rescue story” could appear unembellished were everybody unaware of the role of these “forces of reason” in similar conflicts; for example, in Kosovo. “But frames once entrenched are hard to dispel” (Lakoff, 2003).

The metaphorical model of “foreign policy as a chess game” is a part of the conceptual metaphor “politics as sport”, which presents politics as a set of moves (political decisions) played by strategists

or grandmasters. The player’s goal is to checkmate the opponent’s king. As the outcome of the game is completely dependent on the skill of the player, this metaphor may have negative implications. As the pieces that a political player manipulates are human beings and human lives are at stake, mistakes can cost too much.

The conventional “strict father” model implies that the conflict is over when the nation — child learns its lesson and obeys the authority; the possible outcome of a long-standing rivalry story, involving sanctions as punishment or sanctions as weapons, is, however, not easily predictable. Moreover, the “strict father” model, sufficient to justify involvement of the US in a variety of conflicts, falls into pieces if this “strict father” teaches right from wrong to his own rival.

References

1. Burnes, S. (2011). “Metaphors in press reports of elections: Obama walked on water, but Musharraf was beaten by a knockout.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 2160-2175.
2. Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
3. Charteris-Black, J. & Musolff, A. (2003). “ ‘Battered hero’ or ‘innocent victim’? A comparative study of metaphors for euro trading in British and German financial reporting.” *English for Specific Purposes* 22: 153–176.
4. van Dijk, T. (2006). Racism and the Press in Spain. In Blas J., Casanova M., Velando M. & Vellón J.(Eds.). *Discurso y Sociedad II. Nuevas contribuciones al estudio de la lengua en un contexto social*. Castelló de la Plana: Universitat Jaume I.
5. Goatly, A. (2007). *Washing the brain. Metaphor and Hidden Ideology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
6. Kovecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
7. Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don’t Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green.
8. Lakoff, G. (2000). *Metaphorical Thought in Foreign Policy: Why Strategic Framing Matters to the Global Interdependence Initiative*. The Frameworks Institute. At <http://www.frameworksinstitute.org/products/metaphoralthought.pdf>
9. Lakoff, G. (1996). *Moral Politics. What Conservatives Know that Liberals Don’t*. 2nd edition (2002) published as *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
10. Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980), revised 2003. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
11. Lakoff, G. (2003). *Metaphor and War, Again*. At http://www.alternet.org/story/15414/metaphor_and_war%2C_again.
12. Praggeljaz Group. 2007. MIP: a method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol* 22 (1): 1–39.

DOI: 10.18454/RULB.4.07

Иванова Е.В.

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет

ПОСЛОВИЧНАЯ И АНТИПОСЛОВИЧНАЯ КАРТИНЫ МИРА

Аннотация

В статье описываются некоторые характеристики и способы образования антипословиц. Производится сравнение фрагментов пословичной и антипословичной картин мира, представляющих концепт брака.

Ключевые слова: пословица, антипословица, пословичная картина мира, антипословичная картина мира.

Ivanova E.V.

St. Petersburg State University

PROVERBIAL AND ANTIPROVERBIAL PICTURES OF THE WORLD

Abstract

The paper defines some features and ways of the formation of the antiproverb and focuses on the comparison of two fragments of the proverbial and antiproverbial pictures of the world connected with the concept of marriage.

Keywords: proverb, antiproverb, proverbial picture of the world, antiproverbial picture of the world.

The term “language picture of the world” is extremely popular in modern Russian linguistics. In this paper it is translated word for word from Russian into English, though in modern western linguistics this term is hardly ever used, the closest term for the similar concept being “mapping”. In the opinion of the author of this paper the Russian term, going back to the works of L. Weisgerber (Weisgerber 1953), accounts for the meaning it contains in a very explicit manner, as it really refers to the picture of the world reflected in the semantics of language signs.

While the language picture of the world represents the interpretation of the world in the semantics of language signs taken as a whole, the proverbial picture of the world sheds light on the vision of the world present in the semantics of proverbs.

The proverbial picture of the world is a cognitive structure, in which cultural, social and historic characteristics of native speakers are reflected, as well as the geographic peculiarities of their country (Иванова 2002:17). The knowledge contained in the semantics of proverbs is obsolete to some degree, which is invariably true as far as other constituents of the language picture of the world are concerned. This happens because with the advance of time our language inevitably starts to reflect the culture of the past, as E.Sapir puts it (Sapir 1973:102). If we want to reconstruct a more modern

vision of the world, we must turn to more modern language signs, e.g., antiproverbs.

Antiproverbs are sayings based on traditional proverbs and changing their meaning. There exists a wider understanding of this term, in accordance to which, an antiproverb is not necessarily based on a proverb, but here we will adhere to the above mentioned narrow meaning of the term. Antiproverbs are so called because they challenge the traditional truths expressed by proverbs, sometimes going as far as mocking them.

In general, the basic ways of creating an antiproverb are as follows: the extension of the proverbial sentence, the addition of one or more components to the proverbial sentence, the replacement of a component.

Money talks – and mostly it says “good-bye”. < Money talks

No man is a hero to his wife’s lawyer.< No man is a hero to his valet.

Not all the best things in life are free.< The best things in life are free

Sometimes only the semantic formula of the proverb is preserved, while all or most of the components are replaced and the meaning changed absolutely: