

Metaphor and the Social World, 2016, 6:1, p. 134-155

DOI 10.1075/msw.6.1.06pin

This material is under copyright and the publisher should be contacted for permission to re-use or reprint the material in any form.

**THE ROLE OF METAPHOR AND METONYMY IN FRAMING TERRORISM:
THE CASE OF THE BESLAN SCHOOL HOSTAGE IN RUSSIAN MEDIA**

ABSTRACT

In this paper I analyze the role of metaphor and metonymy in framing conflict events. In particular when framing a terrorist attack in media discourse these linguistic elements are crucial for the interpretation of the event. The data of two Russian newspapers, the *Novaja Gazeta* and the *Rossijskaja Gazeta*, show how metaphorical and metonymical processes are used to promote a particular interpretation and modify the structure of the event itself.

Keywords: Russian, Terrorism, News media, Metaphor, Metonymy

1. Introduction

In the last decades, terrorism has become one of the main topics in the news media worldwide, especially after the terrorist attack at the World Trade Center in New York on September 11th 2001. Since the Bush administration's "war on terror" began, and terrorism became, and continues to be today, a daily life topic, many scholars have started to examine in depth the consequences of reporting terrorism and how the news media and institutions used discourse to create consent among the general population.

Many scholars (among others Lakoff 2004; Charteris-Black 2004; Kennedy 2000; Hellsten 2000) have highlighted the central role played by metaphors and metonymies in favoring a particular interpretation of events in news reporting. In this paper I show how the news media can use metaphors to frame the same event differently. The interpretation promoted by metaphors and metonymies is supported and reinforced by other linguistic elements, such as the use of personal pronouns. The first-person plural personal pronoun is particularly interesting because its deictic reference can be manipulated to serve a specific event interpretation.

In this paper, I analyze how the Beslan School Siege, which took place in North Ossetia on September 1st 2004, has been framed in two different Russian newspapers, the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* and the *Novaja Gazeta*. The paper is structured as follows. In section 2, terrorism is presented as a communicational process (Tuman 2003) and I present the role of metaphors and metonymy in framing terrorism in the news media. In section 3, I describe the data and the methodology of my analysis. Sections 4 and 5 discuss the results of the analysis of metaphors and metonymy in framing events and participants. In section 6, I investigate the use of the first-person plural personal pronoun *my 'we'*, which is a very powerful element for framing the us-group in conflict situations. In the conclusion, I summarize the results of my research.

2.Terrorism as a communication process

After the attack at the World Trade Center in New York in September 2001 many scholars started to analyze terrorism from the point of view of communication. The

violence of terrorism should not be considered to only impact the victims but is “part of a larger process of communicating a message and generating a desired response” (Tuman 2003: 17). Tuman claims that terrorists can be seen as senders of a message to a target audience, which can be the public, a nation-state, an organization, or the government. In this way, terrorism can be seen as a communication process with its own rhetorical dimension: terrorist activity is used to persuade the audience to pay attention to a particular issue. What seems to be central in the communication process is that the meaning of the terrorist act is negotiated among the target audiences through several factors: definitions and labels, symbolism, public discourse and mass media. In the news media the events are not only reported but discussed and interpreted. Norris, Kern and Just (2003) elaborate a model of framing terrorist acts in which the media play a crucial role and can affect the general perception of reality. Moreover, it is hard for the coverage to be completely balanced and objective, especially when the issue is a terrorist act. As other frames, “news frames simplify, prioritize, and structure the narrative flow of events” (Norris, Kern, Just, 2005: 10) and they can unconsciously promote one particular interpretation of events. The use of metaphors and metonymies in this delicate process of negotiation of the meaning is particularly relevant.

According to Cognitive Linguistics (CL), metaphor and metonymy are not mere rhetorical devices but basic processes in human reasoning (Lakoff & Johnson 1980). The metaphorical process is defined as understating one conceptual domain, usually complex and abstract, in terms of another more concrete and simple conceptual domain (Kövecses 2010:4). This “cross domain mapping in the conceptual system” (Lakoff 1993:203) has its linguistic realization in metaphorical expressions¹. Metonymy, on the contrary, is defined as “a cognitive process in which one conceptual entity, the vehicle,

provides mental access to another conceptual entity, the target, within the same domain (...)" (Kövecses 2010:173).² In this paper, the terms metaphor and metonymy are used as defined in CL.

2.1 The role of metaphors in newspaper reporting

The consequences of using metaphors in journalism have been highlighted by several scholars (Hellsten & Renvall 1997, Kennedy 2000, Hellsten 2000, Charteris-Black 2004). Reporting an event using metaphors necessarily implies a process of simplification of the event itself: some aspects are highlighted while others, usually the most inconvenient for the writer, are neglected. Hellsten (2000) suggests that, in order to spread complex issues, the media select those metaphors with a strong cultural impact and a wide interpretation for the readers. In this way a complex and controversial event is simplified, condensed and ready for being understood by the main public. At the same time, the discussion about that event is prevented or, in any case, limited; conversely to literal argumentation, metaphors resume the events focusing on the emotional side while eluding logical reasoning (Kennedy 2000: 262).

Taking into account the property of metaphor of emphasizing some aspects while hiding others, it is important to be aware of the entailments that can arise because they are usually implicit and not immediately accessible to the reader. An example is given by Hellsten and Renvall (1997) who observe that one of the most frequent conventional metaphors used in newspapers for representing politics is the theatre metaphor (together with the game and the business metaphors). Presenting politics as a theatrical performance has important consequences of which readers are not usually aware: the

theatre metaphor implies that politicians, like actors, are playing a role, but it also means that citizens, like spectators, do not take part in the play and are only passive participants.

Particularly interesting for the present discussion is the ambiguity created by a metaphor which can lead to different, and even opposite, interpretations (Hellsten 2000, Vervaeke and Kennedy 1996). When the source and the target domains have several common and comparable elements, the selection of aspects highlighted by the metaphor depends on the thesis supported by the writer: it results that the same metaphor can even serve two opposite purposes (Hellsten 2000: 213-214). Analyzing the metaphors of cloning, Hellsten (2000) shows that the *CLONES ARE MASS PRODUCTS* metaphor was used in two different ways to support and to oppose the sheep Dolly's cloning. On the one hand, the metaphor of the mass production has been used to show that cloning creates imitations of the original product and that scientific action can lead to apocalyptic scenarios; on the other hand, the same metaphor has been used to focus on cloning as an important resource for human organ transplantation while presenting the scientific progress as a controlled process that can improve living conditions.

Turning to political discourse or political issues, several studies (Musolff 2006, Lu & Ahrens 2008) show that the way a metaphor is used to frame events can be motivated by political dispositions and ideology. Analyzing Taiwanese political discourse, Lu and Ahrens (2008) observe that the *BUILDING* metaphor is framed by Taiwanese presidents differently: by using different subsets of this metaphor, each president communicates a particular message which reveals and promotes his political, cultural and ideological worldview.

2.2 The role of metaphor and metonymy in framing terrorism

The use of metaphors in presenting conflict events, and in particular terrorist acts, may reveal the interpretation promoted by the media.

Naming something as terrorism is itself the result of a simplification process, which focuses on some features of the referent while neglecting others. Giving definitions and names is a very important part of the communication process: the name-giver, who must be powerful enough to have that name or definition accepted, can impose her/his worldview (Bathia 2005). Within a given community, some institutions, such as governments, are more powerful than others and can control and shape the perception of citizens. National institutions typically favor certain interpretations, selecting relevant aspects and ignoring disadvantageous and problematic ones: they also decide which aspects can be negotiated or are not negotiable, which ones are true or false (Bathia 2005). In the case of terrorism, governments refer to actions that are taken against the State power. Frame analysis also reveals that the media, when reporting terrorism, take a certain point of view which very often is suggested by state institutions; through the media, that point of view is passed on to the audience. According to Bathia (2005), the naming process has two primary consequences: on the one hand, seeking for supporters by propagating a discourse of belonging and opposition and, on the other hand, justifying one's own action. One of the most effective methods for persuading and appealing to an audience is based on the need of affirming an identity and distinguishing between an in-group and an out-group. Talking about terrorism, the contrast between "us" and "the enemy" is followed by the opposition between good and evil. After defining the in-group and the out-group and assigning the characteristic of

evil to the enemy, the Nation-State legitimizes its own violent acts representing them as good and necessary. Considering that, most of the times, the definition of *terrorist* is decided by State institutions, the identification of terrorist groups is driven by political influences. Furthermore, the process of negotiation is not just a matter of reasoning; it also has emotional aspects. When a violent act takes place and hits innocent people the appeal to reason loses relevance, and emotions take the upper hand. This emotional aspect of the event becomes part of the word itself that refers to it: any time the word terrorism or terrorist is uttered the frames produced will also include this emotional side.

One of the most powerful and widespread metaphors for terrorism is *TERRORISM IS WAR* (Lakoff 2004) which has crucial cognitive consequences. Charteris-Black (2004: 40-41) suggests that this metaphor can be very dangerous especially when goes together with the metaphor *POLITICS IS RELIGION*: metaphorical expressions such as ‘to fight a crusade against terrorism’ and ‘the axis of evil’ lead to the concept of *jihad* and Holy war.

In accordance with the war metaphor, terrorists, terror, and terrorism itself are very often understood as enemies against whom we have to fight. The *ENEMY* metaphor is quite widespread in newspaper reports analyzed here, and there are several occurrences of the Russian equivalent of the Bush administration’s war on terror, *bor’ba s terrorizmom* ‘fight with terrorism’ (see section 4). Another conceptual metaphor used to talk about terrorist attacks is the *NATION IS A HUMAN BODY* metaphor. Musolff (2012:303) claims that thanks to this metaphor a nation state can be ill or healthy and if it is ill, it means that it suffers from some disease caused by parasite and that it needs some therapy. Musolff (2012) observes that *A NATION STATE IS A HUMAN BODY*

metaphor is a very powerful tool with strong consequences because it can be used to qualify the opponent institution, group or individual as “threatening the identity or continued existence of the nation state” (Musolff 2012: 303). Particularly interesting is to notice that the NATION IS A HUMAN BODY metaphor is used differently by the two newspapers and serves opposite purposes (see section 5.1). What will be relevant to our discussion is the use of the word *Rossija* 'Russia' which can be used not only metaphorically through personification, but also metonymically in order to guide the reader to a specific interpretation of the events.

3. The Beslan school hostage in Russian Media

The focus of this research is on one particular tragic event: the terrorist attack at the Beslan school in 2004. On September 1st, 2004 the School Number One (SNO) in Beslan, one of the main city of North Ossetia, was attacked by almost 30-50 Chechen and Ingush terrorists. The terrorist attackers took 1123 people³ hostage and most of them were children (777)⁴. The data shown in this paper are based on a corpus created for this case study. The corpus includes daily reports, interviews and commentaries concerning the terrorist attack at the Beslan school and published on two important Russian newspapers, the *Novaja Gazeta* and the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* (Federal edition).

3.1 The Novaja Gazeta and the Rossijskaja Gazeta

These two newspapers present several differences. Firstly, the *Novaja Gazeta* is published three times a week, while the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* is a daily newspaper. This

difference is reflected in the slight gap of corpora size. I have selected these two newspapers for the analysis because they represent different political orientations, especially concerning the Russian policy in the Caucasus. The *Rossijskaja Gazeta* is an official newspaper of the Russian Federation, and its political view supports the government line; on the contrary, the *Novaja Gazeta* is a newspaper of liberal views and critical of the Russian government, especially with respect to its policy in the Caucasus. The two newspapers also address different audiences: the audience of the *Novaja Gazeta* is represented by people of liberal views, while the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* addresses “even tempered adults of conservative views”⁵ as specified on its web-site.

The following analysis shows how different political views affect the language used in the articles, and how language can manipulate the interpretation of the events.

3.2 Corpus and methodology

My analysis is based on articles from the two Russian newspapers published on-line between September 2nd and September 9th 2004. The data presented in the following pages reveal how the two newspapers have interpreted and framed the event immediately after the tragedy. In order to compile the two corpora, I have chosen only the articles concerning the terrorist attack at the Beslan School or general problems of terrorism.

Table 1. Size (number of words) of the two corpora analyzed

	<i>N° of words</i>
<i>Novaja Gazeta</i>	22 615
<i>Rossijskaja Gazeta</i>	30 104

Table 1 shows the size of the two corpora. The corpus from the *Novaja Gazeta* (33 articles) is slightly smaller than the corpus from the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* (51 articles). This is due to the first difference mentioned in the previous section: the *Novaja Gazeta* is published three times a week, while the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* is published every day. Despite this, the two corpora are very similar and comparable: they both include articles describing the events, commentaries on the events and general commentaries on terrorism in Russia and abroad. In order to make the two corpora comparable, raw frequencies have been converted into percentages.

The selected articles have been read and qualitatively analyzed. Metaphors have been retrieved both manually and by searching the corpus for keywords belonging to the target domain, such as *terror*, *terrorism*, *terrorist*, *Russia*, *power* and *system*. The program used to search the corpus is *antconc* which outputs the total number of occurrences of the keyword and all its concordances. Especially looking at concordances, I have found several words which function as vehicles and activate the metaphorical interpretation. When all metaphorical expressions have been retrieved, I grouped them according to the conceptual metaphor that they reflect (Charteris-Black 2004). Analyzing how both conceptual and linguistic metaphors were used, I could investigate the interpretation of the event promoted by the two newspapers.

The following data highlight that the analysis of metaphor and metonymy is a useful tool for the understanding of the way in which events are interpreted, which protagonists are considered relevant, and how they are presented. This is particularly interesting in conflicts, in which the simplification of events tends to create a two-side world: the 'us' and the 'enemy'. Framing differently the protagonists, the events themselves acquire another possible interpretation.

4. Metaphors of terrorism: fighting against an enemy

As I have already explained in section 2.2, the enemy metaphor is very widespread in framing terrorist events. In this paragraph I analyze how the enemy metaphor is used in the two newspapers.

As a first step, I have searched the corpus for words referring to terrorism, such as *terrorizm* 'terrorism', *terror* 'terror', *terrorističeskij* 'terrorist-adj', *antiterrorističeskij* 'antiterrorist-adj', etc. Thanks to the analysis of concordances, it is possible to highlight hidden parts of meanings and to identify metaphors that reveal how terrorism and the terrorist attack are conceptualized. Table 2 shows the occurring frequency of the words referring to terrorism in the corpus.

Table 2. Reference to terrorism in the two corpora

	All words referring to terrorism	
	Raw frequency	%
<i>Novaja Gazeta</i>	133	0.58
<i>Rossijskaja Gazeta</i>	310	1.031

It is immediately clear that in the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* references to terrorism are twice as frequent as in the *Novaja Gazeta*.

Looking at concordances, a frequent expression in the corpus is *bor'ba s terrorizmom*⁶ 'fight with terrorism', which can be considered the Russian equivalent of the Bush administration's "war on terrorism". Considering *terror* and *terrorism*, it has been noticed that the preference for one of these two terms is not meaningless. Analyzing the American slogan "war on terror", Lakoff (2006: 28-30) notices that terror, which is a state of mind, an emotion, is considered to be an army. This metaphorical expression has several relevant consequences: war on terror does not have an end, because we cannot defeat emotions forever; in addition, the word "war" activates a frame in which the government must defend citizens by any means, justifying its future actions.

The expression *bor'ba s terrorom* 'war on terror' very rarely occurs in the *Novaja Gazeta* and in the *Rossijskaja Gazeta*, but I give an example in (1) and (2).

- 1) *Vo-vtorych, gotovy aktivno sotrudničat' s gosudarstvennymi organami, kotorye budut zanimat'sja bor'boj s terrorom. (Rossijskaja Gazeta – federal'nyj vypusk N°3572 ot 8 sentjabrja 2004)*

Secondly, we are ready to cooperate with State organisms involved in the fight on terror.

- 2) *My podderživaem vse dejstvija vlastej, napravlennye na real'nuju bor'bu s terrorom, na real'nuju zaščitu graždan Rossii. (Novaja Gazeta 09.09.2004)*

We support all actions of the authorities aimed to a real fight on terror, to a real defense of Russian citizens.

Both Russian newspapers prefer to use the expression *bor'ba s terrorizmom* 'fight with terrorism' as in examples (3) and (4).

- 3) *(...)prezident, fakičeski priznavšij, čto v strane net političeskich i social'nych instrumentov bor'by s terrorizmom, prizval k "mobilizacii nacii pered obščej opasnanst'ju". (Novaja Gazeta 09.09.2004)*

(...) the president, after he had admitted that there is no political and social instrument for the war on terrorism in the country, called for "the mobilitation of the nation in front of common danger".

- 4) *Terrorizm javljaetsja ugolovnym prestupleniem meždunarodnogo charaktera i podležit osuždeniju vsemi gosudarstvami vne zavisimosti ot togo, gde oni nachodjatsja. Dlja bor'by s terrorizmom zaključeno bolee 20 meždunarodnych konvencij (Rossijskaja Gazeta – Federal'nyj vypusk N° 3569 ot 3 sentjabrja 2004)*

Terrorism is an international criminal offence and is subject to conviction by all nations, irrespective of their location. For the war on terrorism, more than 20 international conventions have been set up.

In these sentences, terrorism is metaphorically understood as the real enemy against whom we must fight. In comparison to the expression analyzed by Lakoff (“war on terror”), the word *terrorizm* 'terrorism' does not refer to a state of mind or to an emotion, but to an event of violence; however, the consequences of using the war metaphor to frame terrorism remain: whenever something is defined as terrorism any reaction of State institutions is justified (Bathia 2005). Widening the analysis, the construction [*bor'ba s/protiv* + noun] '[war against+ noun]' occurs several times in the corpus. Table 3 summarizes the results:

Table 3. References to terrorism in the two corpora

	<i>Terrorist/Fighter</i>	<i>Terror</i>	<i>Terrorism</i> ⁴	Others	Total
<i>Novaja Gazeta</i>	1 (5.26)	3 (15.78)	12 (63.15)	4 (21.05)	20
<i>Rossijskaja Gazeta</i>	4 (14.28)	2 (7.14)	19 (67.85)	3 (10.71)	28

The two newspapers show interesting differences in relation to the construction [*bor'ba s/protiv*+noun]. As we have already seen, *terrorizm* 'terrorism' is the most frequent noun occurring in this construction in both newspapers, with 12 occurrences in the *Novaja Gazeta* and 19 occurrences in the *Rossijskaja Gazeta*. Out of this specific structure, and out of the war metaphor, the noun *terror* is more frequent in the *Novaja Gazeta* (18.79 %) than in the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* (6.45 %). Terror is an emotion that

⁴ In this group are included the cases in which there are personal pronouns referring to terrorism or the case where terrorism is a specification (war against the attack of terrorism)

readers know and experience in their life: the *Novaja Gazeta* wants to involve the readers referring to an emotion that they can clearly understand. Table 3 also shows that the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* prefers more specific references not only to terrorism, but to the actors of this attack, *terroristy* 'terrorists' and *boeviki* 'fighters'.

5. Framing a country

Especially in conflict situations, describing and framing the actors involved in the event is extremely important. In this case, the Russian Federation is one of the main actors and, for this reason, I decided to look for the key word *Rossija* 'Russia' to investigate how the two newspapers frame this main protagonist. In this section, I focus on metaphors and metonymies used to frame Russia as a State.

In the analysis, I have distinguished the occurrences of *Rossija* 'Russia' with metaphorical interpretation from those with metonymical interpretation. It can be noticed that the two metaphors discussed in 5.1, NATION IS A HUMAN BEING and NATION IS A HUMAN BODY, are metonymy-based metaphors: the metonymy NATION FOR THE PEOPLE (discussed in 5.2) is at the basis of the process of personification of a nation. Radden defines the metonymy-based metaphor as a mapping which involves “two conceptual domains which are grounded in, or can be traced back to, one conceptual domain” (Radden 2000: 93). Many scholars (among others Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez 1997, Radden 2000, Goossens 2003) have discussed the interference between metaphor and metonymy and how these two processes are not always clearly distinct, but rather form a continuum. However, no ambiguous cases have been found in the corpus and all

the occurrences of *Rossija* 'Russia' have been interpreted either as a metaphor or as a metonymy.

5.1 Two metaphorical Russias

According to the data, both the *Novaja Gazeta* and the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* personify *Rossija* 'Russia' and they frame the events through the metaphor NATION IS A HUMAN BEING. Let us look at some examples (5-6) from the *Rossijskaja Gazeta*:

- 5) *Terakty poslednich dnej – test na vyživanie dlja Rossii. My ego ne prošli. (Rossijskaja Gazeta . Federal'nyj vypusk n° 3567 ot 2 sentjabrja 2004)*

The terrorist attacks of these last days were a test of survival for Russia. We did not pass it.

- 6) *Rossija ne odinoka v svoem gore. (Rossijskaja Gazeta . Federal'nyj vypusk n° 3572 del 8 sentjabrja 2004)*

Russia is not alone in its sorrow.

In example (5), the word *vyživanie* 'survival' activates the metaphor by which Russia is framed as a person close to death. The words referring to life (*žizn* 'life'– *vyživanie* 'survival') let Russia immediately become alive and take the status of an animate being. In example (6), the word *gore* 'sorrow' serves as a cue for metaphorical interpretation. The word *Rossija*, combined with a term of emotion, acquires the status of human being. Thanks to this last example, Russia is not only a human being with physical properties (example 5), but its emotional and inner side becomes central. In examples (4) and (5), the metaphor NATION IS A HUMAN BEING is used in the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* to frame Russia as a suffering person.

Russia is personified also in the *Novaja Gazeta* but there are fewer occurrences (example 7).

7) *V èti dni tragediju perežila Rossija.* (*Novaja Gazeta* 06.09.2004)

In these days Russia suffered a tragedy.

In example (7) Russia is framed as a suffering person. However, the following examples will show that the personification of Russia in the *Novaja Gazeta* has a completely different aim. Let us look at the example (8) and (9):

8) *Rossija vo vtoroj polovine XIX veka porodila sovremennyj terrorism, v tom čisle samoubijstvennyj: zdes' byla razrabotana teorija podpol'nogo terrora kak političeskogo orudija.* (*Novaja Gazeta* 06.09.2004)

In the second half of XIX century, Russia gave birth to present-day terrorism, including suicide (terrorism): in that moment the theory of the clandestine terror as political means has been developed.

In example (8), the metaphor NATION IS A HUMAN BEING is used to draw attention to Russia's responsibilities in the events. The linguistic metaphor frames Russia as a mother who gives birth to terrorism. This image of the Nation as a mother is very important in Russian culture: the concept of *rodina* 'homeland' is usually associated to motherhood and *rodina-mat'* 'mother-homeland' is a very important collocation in Russian (Wierzbicka 1997:192). Here, the Mother metaphor is used to frame an event in which Russia has a central role: it is the origin, the mother of terrorism. Consider example (9):

9) *Kak sistema bor'by s terrorom poroždaet ego* (title - *Novaja Gazeta* 09.09.2004)

How the system of struggle against terror gives birth to it.

In example (9), the metaphor is more specific because it is not the entire Russia which is responsible of the birth of terrorism, but only the “system”. As it will become clear in sections 5.2 and 6, in the *Novaja Gazeta* the Russian power is a key participant in the events and it is frequently personified.

Another metaphor is used by the two newspapers to frame the events: the NATION IS A HUMAN BODY metaphor. This metaphor is similar to the previous one but it is more specific and allows interesting framings. The two Russian newspapers use this metaphor in two completely different ways to promote opposite interpretations of the event. In the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* the Republic of North Ossetia, the region of the Russian Federation attacked by terrorists, is conceptualized through this metaphor.

10) *Ranenaja respublika*

(...) *praktičeski vsja respublika okazalas' ranennoj terroristami. (Rossijskaja Gazeta – Federal'nyj vypusk n° 3569 ot 3 sentjabrja 2004)*

Wounded republic

(...) almost the whole republic turned out wounded by terrorists.

In example (10), the Ossetian Republic is personified, as Russia was in the previous examples (5 and 6). Here, however, the metaphor is very specific. In the data of the *Rossijskaja Gazeta*, *ranennyj* 'wounded' is the most frequent adjective used to describe the children and the victims of the terrorist attack, who were gathered by the terrorists in the gym. Consequently, the Republic of North Ossetia is metaphorically understood not only as a suffering person, but it is framed as an innocent child, a victim of the terrorists. In the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* the whole country is personified as a suffering person and, more precisely, as the victim.

Interestingly enough, while in the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* the most frequent metaphors related to illness are used to frame Russia as a victim, in the *Novaja Gazeta* they are used to personify the Russian system and the Russian power. Let us consider the following examples:

- 11) *Sistema bor'by s terrorizmom v Rossii gluboko bol'na i sama javljaetsja blagodatnoj počvoj dlja razvitija i rasprostranjenja terrorizma po vsej strane. (Novaja Gazeta 09.09.2004)*

The system of struggle on terrorism in Russia is deeply sick and it is the fertile soil for the development and diffusion of terrorism in whole country.

- 12) *Dobrovol'no soglasilis' na "kryšu" specslužb, kotorye, kak rakovaja opuchol', prorosli metastazami vo vse vlastnye struktury. (Novaja Gazeta 06.09.2004)*

Voluntarily (you) agreed on the protection of the special forces, which as a cancerous swelling, germinated as metastases in the whole power-holding structures.

As we see in example (11) the *Novaja Gazeta* uses the metaphor NATION IS A HUMAN BODY to frame Russian power as an ill body. In example (12) the metaphor goes even further: the Russian system is ill and has several metastases, but the cancer is internal. In example (11) the Russian power and system are framed as diseased persons and in example (12) the metaphor better explains that Russia's healthiness is threatened by an internal cancer. Remarkably, the two newspapers use the NATION IS A HUMAN BODY metaphor in different fashions. In the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* the country (*Rossija*) is wounded by terrorists who are responsible of the death of the metaphorical body, which is wounded as in example (10); on the contrary, in the *Novaja Gazeta* the Russian power is portrayed as being ill from internal diseases and no other external agents are framed. The framing of Russia as a Nation, on the one hand, and the framing of Russian power, on the other hand, provide a first cue for further analysis (see section 6).

It must be highlighted that in the *Novaja Gazeta* the illness metaphor is used to frame terrorism. We find words such as *spid* 'AIDS', *profilaktika* 'prophylaxis' as shown in examples (13) and (14).

- 13) *Terrorism - èto spid, radiacija čelovečestva. Ego ne dostat' nikakimi zaklinanijami, nikakimi kaznjami, v rezul'tate kotorych ne ostaetsja svidetelej.* (*Novaja Gazeta* 09.09.2004)

Terrorism is AIDS, a radiation for mankind. It cannot be reached by any invocations, any executions and as a result no witnesses are left.

- 14) *Èksperty FSB, analiziruju situaciju posle moskovskich teraktov, ne raz otmečali: v profilaktike terrorizma osobenno važno to, čto proisходит na mestach, - rabota učastkovykh inspektorov i mestnykh milicejskich otdelenij.* (*Novaja Gazeta* 06.09.2004)

Analyzing the situation after the terrorist acts in Moscow, the experts of FSB more than once noted: what happens in working points, the work of district inspectors and local police stations, is important as a prophylaxis for terrorism.

In these examples, terrorism is metaphorically understood as a disease that Russia must cure. Considering the metaphors used in the *Novaja Gazeta*, the event interpretation is clear: the problems of Russia are all internal. On the one hand, there are forces that threaten the Russian system from inside (examples 12 and 14) and, on the other hand, there is terrorism which is not an external agent, but internal because it is Russia itself that gives birth to it (example 8). The analysis shows that the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* frames two protagonists, the victim (Russia) and the aggressor (terrorists): by using the NATION IS A HUMAN BEING metaphor, Russia is presented as a suffering person attacked from an external enemy. On the contrary, in the *Novaja Gazeta* the metaphor NATION IS A HUMAN BEING is used to present Russia as the origin, the mother of terrorism; this frame is reinforced by the NATION IS A HUMAN BODY metaphor which

presents Russia as a ill person who has metastases in her body. In this way the *Novaja Gazeta* only frames the ill person (Russia) with all her internal diseases. These metaphors are strengthened by metonymical framing and by other linguistic elements, such as the first person plural pronoun (see section 6).

5.2 Two metonymic Russias

In this section, we consider the occurrences in which the word *Rossija* 'Russia' is a metonymy and we analyze how they reinforce the metaphorical framing and the discrepancies in the two newspapers. There is nothing extraordinary in using the NATION FOR THE PEOPLE metonymy, but what is relevant here is the referent of the metonymy. As we have already noticed in the metaphor analysis, the two newspapers present differently the protagonists in the events and those frames are reinforced by metonymies and the use of the first person plural personal pronoun (see section 6).

As described in section 2.2, one of the consequences of defining terrorism, and more generally conflict situations, is the creation of two opposite groups: “us” and “the enemy”. Since the terrorist attack involved Russian citizens and the data analyzed come from Russian media, the noun *Rossija* 'Russia' is very likely to represent metonymically the in-group. Considering the examples in which the word *Rossija* 'Russia' metonymically represents an entity composed by people, it is possible to identify differences in the interpretation. In the *Rossijskaja Gazeta*, *Rossija* 'Russia' refers to Russians, underlying the unity of the Russian government and the Russian people (15-16).

15) (...) *meždunarodnym terrorizmom i ego peredovym otrjadom na našej territorii, **terrorizmom** čečenskich “separatistov”, ob’javlena total’naja vojna protiv **Rossii**. (Rossijskaja Gazeta – Federal’nyj vypusk N° 3571 ot 7 sentjabrja 2004)*

(...) a total war was declared against **Russia** by **international terrorism** and its advanced detachment in our country, by **terrorism of Chechen “separatists”**.

16) *I èto pozvoljaet sdelat’ vyvod, što protiv **Rossii** načala dejstvovat’ **novaja voenno-političeskaja sila**, kotoraja značitel’no lučše, čem čečenskie separatisty, osnaščena resursami i finansami, čelovečeskimi i tehnologičeskimi. (Rossijskaja Gazeta – Federal’nyj vypusk N° 3569 ot 3 sentjabrja 2004)*

Also this allows to draw the conclusion that **a new military-political force**, which is equipped with resources and finances, men and technologies considerably more than Chechen separatists, began acting against **Russia**.

The picture of Russia that comes out of these examples, and from the articles of the *Rossijskaja Gazeta*, is a united Russia, a union between the Russian citizens and the Russian government. In examples (15) and (16), the metonymical interpretation of the word *Rossija* 'Russia' occurs in a very specific context. In both examples the enemy is mentioned (in bold) and the general idea is that Russia as a whole is under the attack of an outer force. Naming and framing the enemy, the unity of the nation is reinforced.

In the *Novaja Gazeta* the metonymical process involved in the comprehension of the word *Rossija* 'Russia' frames the entity differently. Let us consider examples (17) and (18).

17) ***Rossii** nužna vlast’, umejuščaja spasat’. (Novaja Gazeta – 06.09.2004)*

Russia needs a **power** which is able to rescue.

18) *A segodnja **Rossii** nužen imenno takoj **prezident** – umejuščij i želajuščij spasti ot terrora.*
(*Novaja Gazeta* – 06.09.2004)

And today **Russia** needs that very **president** who is able and wants to save (her) from terror.

Trying to identify the real referent for *Rossija* in examples (17) and (18), we are most likely to interpret it as including the Russian people and excluding the Russian government. The context helps us understand this opposition between the Russian government and the referent of *Rossija*. The Russian government or its members, are always mentioned next to the word *Rossija: vlast'* 'power' in example (17) and *president* 'president' in example (18). If the Russian political class were itself part of *Rossija*, there would not be the necessity to name it again in the sentence. In fact, here, the journalist wants to underline that *vlast'* and *prezident* are two entities which are not part of the referent of *Rossija*. The different attitude of the two newspapers towards the events becomes clearer. In the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* the focus is on the war that an external force has declared to Russia and two opposite groups may be identified: Russia and the external force, the enemy. In the *Novaja Gazeta*, on the contrary, the focus is on internal problems of Russia as a country. Here, the journalist contrasts Russia and the Russian government: they are two distinct opposite entities. The metonymical presentation of Russia was predicted by the metaphor analysis in section 5.1 and it is confirmed by the use of the first-person plural personal pronoun (see section 6).

6. Personal pronouns: framing the us-group

The relevance of the first-person plural personal pronoun in public and political discourse has been highlighted by several scholars (Fairclough 1989, Wilson 1990, Santulli 2005). In particular, the pronoun *my* 'we' plays an important role because of its specific nature and its pragmatic consequences on the audience. The first-person plural pronoun is discussed by Benveniste (1966-1990a, 1966-1990b). Benveniste (1966-1990b) identifies two forms of the personal pronoun *we*: the inclusive form, which refers to the speaker and the audience (*I+you*), and the exclusive form, which excludes the audience including a third person (*I+ they*). The ambiguity of the inclusive and exclusive forms can be used, on the one hand, to cancel the distance between the speaker and the audience and, on the other hand, to cancel the presence of the speaker himself in order to have an apparently objective discourse. In pragmatics these effects are called *embrayage/débrayage*. In his book "Language and power", Fairclough (1989) noticed the high frequency of inclusive forms of first-person plural pronouns in political publishing: using *we*, journalists seem to speak not only for themselves, but also for the readers and for the British citizens. The newspaper can identify itself with the government, the international community, with wider or more limited groups which can be part of the inclusive first-person plural pronoun *we*: in this way the journalist conveys a sense of unity, while minimizing the possibility of divergent interests (*embrayage*). The nature of the first-person plural pronoun allows the speaker/writer to define the referent as he/she prefers, adding cues for events framing. For this reason, I decided to investigate how the personal pronoun *my* 'we' is used in the two newspapers, the *Novaja Gazeta* and the *Rossijskaja Gazeta*. As we have already mentioned in

section 2.2, structuring and framing the us-group is particularly important when reporting conflict situations. The frames created by the personal pronoun *my* 'we' are a very powerful means for shaping and directing the interpretation of reality.

6.1 The us-group in the *Novaja Gazeta* and in the *Rossijskaja Gazeta*

First of all, I identified all the occurrences of the first-person plural pronoun in all grammatical cases: the nominative *my*, the genitive, the accusative and the prepositional *nas*, the dative *nam* and the instrumental *nami*. After that, I identified their referents and I summarized the results in Table 4.

Table 4. Referents of the personal pronoun *my* 'we'. The percentage is calculated on the total number of occurrences of the personal pronoun.

	Russian people		Russian government		Russia as a whole		Total	
	Raw freq.	%	Raw freq.	%	Raw freq.	%	Raw freq.	%
<i>Novaja Gazeta</i>	74	36.63	8	3.96	45	22.27	127	62.86
<i>Rossijskaja Gazeta</i>	23	19.16	24	20	44	36.66	91	75.82

The possible referents have not been selected *a priori*, but they have been identified starting from the data. The three referents relevant for this discussion have been included in Table 4. The label “Russian people” includes only the Russian society excluding the political power; on the contrary, “Russian government” refers to the political class excluding the citizens. Under the label “Russia (as a whole)” are included

both the Russian government and the Russian people. The other referents, for examples “Journalist” and “Protagonists” have been omitted because they are not relevant to the present discussion. In examples (19) and (20), the first-person plural pronoun is used to frame the us-group which consists of both the Russian society and the Russian government.

19) *Ne nam nužno prisoeinit'sja k Amerike v bor'be s terorizmom, a Amerike k nam. (Rossijskaja Gazeta – Federal'nyj vypusk n° 3567 ot 2 sentjabrja 2004)*

We don't need to join the Usa in struggling against terrorism, it's the Usa (that need to) join **us**.

20) *Nam ob'javili vojnu bez fronta. (Rossijskaja Gazeta – Federal'nyj vypusk n° 3567 ot 2 sentjabrja 2004 - title)*

(They) declared war with no front on **us**.

In example (19), the cohesion between the society and the government is achieved comparing the personal pronoun *my 'we'* with the noun referring to another country: thanks to the opposition with the noun *Amerika 'America'*, the personal pronoun *nam 'us'* automatically refers to Russia as a whole, as a country. In example (20) the personal pronoun refers to Russia as a whole: terrorists have declared war to Russia as a country. In the *Novaja Gazeta*, as shown in Table 4, the personal pronoun *my 'we'* refers most of the times to the Russian society, excluding the Russian government (21 - 22).

21) *Teper' nam predlagajut usilit' vlast' tech, komu my objazany nacional'nym pozorom. (Novaja Gazeta 09.09.2004)*

Now (they) suggest **us** to reinforce the **power** of those (people), to whom **we** owe national infamy.

22) *Rossijskaja vlast' kontakt s terroristami ne našla. V rezul'tate my ponesly strašnye poteri.*
(*Novaja Gazeta* 06.09.2004)

Russian power did not find any contact with terrorists. As a result **we** suffered terrible losses.

In examples (21) and (22), the personal pronoun *my* 'we' clearly refers only to the Russian people. In these sentences the opposition between the Russian society and the Russian power is well defined: the Russian power is always mentioned in contrast to the us-group. Mentioning both the Russian power and the us-group, the journalist not only wants to underline the fact that they are two different entities, but also that these two protagonists have two completely different aims. The framing proposed by the *Novaja Gazeta* promotes cohesion among the Russian society which is in contrast to the Russian government. This opposition becomes even clearer in the poetry of the Russian poet Evgenij Aleksandrovič Evtušenko, which was published in the *Novaja Gazeta* on September 9th 2004.

NE MY, A VY

NOT US, BUT YOU

Ne my, a vy postavili stranu

Not us, but you put the country

V takuju pozu, čto nazvat'-to stydno,

In this posture, that it's a shame to name,

Ne my, a vy bezdarnuju vojnu

Not us, but you lead useless war

Vedete – i konca vojne ne vidno.

and the end of the war is not visible

(...)

(...)

In his poetry, Evtušenko introduces only two characters: we, the Russian people and you, the Russian government. Here, the poet puts the blame on the Russian government which is responsible for the deaths of its citizens.

Even if most of the times in the *Novaja Gazeta* the first-person plural pronoun refers only to the Russian people to create cohesion among citizens, there are also cases in which the pronoun *my* 'we' refers to Russia as a whole (example 23).

23) *Za vse otvratitel'noe, sdellanoe **nami** v Čečne i Ingušetii, otvetili ni v čem ne povinnye deti v Beslane.* (*Novaja Gazeta* 06.09.2004)

Innocent children in Beslan answered for all bad we have done in Chechnya and in Ingushetia.

Looking at these occurrences, it can be noticed that, even in these cases the pronoun is used differently by the *Novaja Gazeta* in comparison to the *Rossijskaja Gazeta*. In the *Novaja Gazeta* the reference to Russia as a whole is used to make the public consciousness arise among the Russian people: both the Russian government and the Russian citizens are responsible for the tragedy. However, later in the same article, the responsibility of the Russian citizens is specified (example 24). In addition, the personal pronoun *my* 'we' is used, once again, in opposition to the Russian Government.

24) *Ja govorju “**my**”, potomu čto imenno **my, graždane Rossii**, ètu ne spasobnuju k bor'be s terrorizmom **vlast'** izbrali.* (*Novaja Gazeta* 06.09.2004)

I say “**we**”, because only **us, citizens of Russia**, we have chosen a **power** which is not able to fight against terrorism.

In sum, the analysis of the first-person plural pronoun helps define and describe the events which are framed by metaphors and metonymies. In the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* the main characters are two, Russia which is the us-group, and the terrorists (the enemy).

These two characters are opposed to each other. In the *Novaja Gazeta* the main characters are three: the Russian government, the Russian society and the terrorists. In framing the events, the *Novaja Gazeta* gives less relevance to the terrorists while the main opposition is between the Russian government and the Russian people. These differences in framing the events reflect the different political orientation of the two newspapers.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, I have investigated how the terrorist attack at the Beslan school was framed during the first week by two important Russian newspapers: the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* and the *Novaja Gazeta*. In order to understand how the linguistic elements affect the conceptualization of the terrorist attack and of its consequences, I have carried out an analysis of the metaphors involved and reinforced by metonymies and the use of the first-person plural personal pronoun. The analysis of metaphors has shown that the two newspapers use the same metaphors for presenting events but have opposite purposes. The metaphors NATION IS A HUMAN BODY and NATION IS A HUMAN BEING are used by the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* to frame Russia as the victim of an external attack; on the contrary, the *Novaja Gazeta* uses the same metaphors to focus on Russian responsibilities. Moreover, the analysis of metonymies and the use of the personal pronoun *my* 'we' reveal how the two newspapers frame differently the situations and the protagonists. In the *Rossijskaja Gazeta* the us-group is composed by the whole Russian society, including both the government and the citizens, and it is opposed to the enemy, the terrorists. In the *Novaja Gazeta* the scenario changes radically: the us-group includes

only the Russian citizens, excluding institutions, while the Russian government represents the out-group, the enemy. By means of all these linguistic elements which frame the events, the reader is led to a specific interpretation of reality which reflects the political leanings of the newspaper.

REFERENCES

- Bathia, M. V. (2005). Fighting words: naming terrorists, bandits, rebels and other violent actors. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 1, 5-22.
- Benveniste, É. (1966-1990a). “La nature des pronomes”, in *For Roman Jakobson*, The Hague, Mouton; it. trad.: “La natura dei pronomi”, in: *Problemi di linguistica generale*, Milano, il Saggiatore: 301-308
- Benveniste, É. (1966-1990b). “Structure des relations de personne dans le verbe”, in *For Roman Jakobson*, The Hague, Mouton; it. trad.: “Struttura delle relazioni di persona nel verbo”, in: *Problemi di linguistica generale*, Milano, il Saggiatore: 269-282
- Cameron, L., Pelosi, A. & Pedroso de Moraes Feltes, H. (2014). Metaphorizing Violence in the UK and Brazil: A Contrastive Discourse Dynamics Study. *Metaphor and symbol*, 29, 23-43.

- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*.
Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Croft, W. & D.A. Cruse (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.
- Dunn, E.W., Moore, M. & Nosek, B.A. (2005). The war of the words: How linguistic
differences in reporting shape perceptions of terrorism. *Analysis of social issues and
public policy*, vol. 5, No 1, 67-86.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*, London & New York: Longman.
- Ferrari, A. (2007). *Breve storia del Caucaso*, Roma: Carocci.
- Goossens, L. (2003). Metaphonymy: the interaction of metaphor and metonymy in
expressions for linguistic action. In Dirven, R. & Pörings, R. (eds.), *Metaphor and
Metonymy in comparison and contrast* (pp. 349-378). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hellsten, I. (2000). Dolly: Scientific Breakthrough or Frankenstein's Monster?
Journalistic and Scientific Metaphors of Cloning. *Metaphor and symbol*, 15(4):
213-221.
- Hellsten, I. & Renvall, M. (1997). Inside or Outside of Politics? Metaphor and Paradox
in Journalism. *Nordicom Review*, vol.18, No 2, 41- 47.
- Hughes, J. (2007). The Chechnya Conflict: Freedom Fighters or Terrorists?.
Demokratizatsiya: The journal of Post-Soviet democratization, 15 (3)., 293-311
- Hülse, R. and Spencer, A. (2008). The Metaphor of Terror: Terrorism *Studies and the
Constructivist Turn*. *Security Dialogue* 39, No. 6: 571-92.

- Kagarlitsky, B. (2006). The anatomy of terror, in *Russian Politics and Law*, vol. 44, no. 1, January-February 2006, 81-93.
- Kennedy, V. (2000). Intended Tropes and Unintended Metatropes in Reporting on the War in Kosovo. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 15(4), 253-265.
- Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: a Practical Introduction* (Second edition), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kruglanski, A. W., Crenshaw, M., Post, J. M. & Victoroff, J. (2008). What should this fight be called? Metaphors of counterterrorism and their implications, *Psychological science in the public interest*, 8(3), 97-133.
- Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In Ortony, A., *Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 202-251), second edition, Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2001). Metaphor of Terror.
<http://www.press.uchicago.edu/sites/daysafter/911lakoff.html>
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*, Chelsea Green.
- Lakoff, G. (2006). *Thinking points. Communicating our American values and vision*, Tides Center/Rockridge Institute.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lu, L. & Ahrens, K. (2008). Ideological influence on BUILDING metaphors in Taiwanese presidential speeches. *Discourse & Society*, 19(3), 383-408.

- Musolff, A. (2006). Metaphor Scenarios in Public Discourse. *Metaphor and symbol*, 21(1), 23-38.
- Musolff, A. (2012). Special feature. The study of metaphor as part of critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, Vol.9, No 3, 301-310.
- Norris, P. & Kern, M. & Just, M. (2003). *Framing Terrorism. The News Media, the Government and the Public*, New York: Routledge.
- Popovski, V. (2007). Terrorizing Civilians as a “Counter-terrorist Operation”: Crimes and Impunity in Chechnya. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, Vol. 7, No 3, September 2007, 431-447.
- Radden, G. (2000). How metonymic are metaphors?. In Barcelona, A. (ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads* (pp. 93-108), Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, F.J. (1997). Metaphor, metonymy and conceptual interaction. *Atlantis. Journal of the Spanish Association for Anglo-American Studies*, 19(1), 281-295.
- Russel, J. (2005). Terrorists, bandits, spooks and thieves: Russian demonization of the Chechens before and since 9/11. *Third World Quarterly*, vol.26, No. 1., 101-116.
- Santulli, F. (2005). *Le parole del potere, il potere delle parole: retorica e discorso politico*, Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Tuman, J. S. (2003). *Communicating terror: The rhetorical dimension of terrorism*, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Vervaeke, J. & Kennedy, J.M. (1996). Metaphors in Language and Thought:

Falsification and Multiple Meanings. *Metaphor and symbolic activity*, 11(4), 273-284.

Wierzbicka, A. (1997). *Understanding Culture through Their Key Words. English, Russian, Polish, German and Japanese*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, J. (1990). *Politically speaking*, London, Blackwell.

All data have been retrieved from September 2009 to April 2010 from:

www.novayagazeta.ru

www.rg.ru

NOTES

¹ In this paper conceptual metaphors are in small capital letters. Systematic metaphors are in small italic capital letters. Metaphorical expressions are underlined in all examples.

² In this paper conceptual metonymies are in small capital letters. Metonymies are in bold in the examples.

³ http://www.unicef.org/russia/media_4875.html

⁴ http://www.unicef.org/russia/media_4875.html

⁵ From www.rg.ru/about.html

⁶ *Terrorizmom* and *terrorom* are the instrumental case forms respectively of the noun *terrorizm* 'terrorism' and *terror* 'terror'. The instrumental case is required by the preposition *s* 'with'.