DOI: 10.11649/sm.3288

Slavia Meridionalis 25, 2025
Article No.: 3288

Citation:
Musolff, A. (2025). The nation's soul and motherhood: Conceptualizations of the state as a body or person in Slavic L1-ELF responses. *Slavia Meridionalis*, *25*, Article 3288. https://doi.org/10.11649/sm.3288

Andreas Musolff
University of East Anglia
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5635-7517

The Nation's Soul and Motherhood: Conceptualizations of the State as a Body or Person in Slavic L1-ELF Responses

1. Introduction

To depict a nation as a body or a person is a conceptual metaphor that has a long pedigree in the history of ideas. Its origins in the Western tradition are located in Ancient Greek pre-Socratic thinking, with a first flourish in the writings of Plato (*The Republic* and *Timaios*) and Aristotle (*Politics* and *On the movement of animals*), followed by many Hellenistic and Roman philosophers, the Stoics, Neo-Platonists. They also appear in Biblical traditions (e.g., *St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans* and *Corinthians*), which were taken up by the "Church Fathers" and most political and social theorists from the early Middle Ages onwards, continuing up to the 20th and 21st centuries

This work was supported by the University of East Anglia and from the People Programme (Marie Curie Actions) of the European Union's *Seventh Framework Programme* (FP7/2007–2013) under REA grant agreement № [609305] for a fellowship at the Freiburg Institute of Advanced Studies (FRIAS), University of Freiburg, Germany.

Competing interests: no competing interests have been declared.

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited. © The Author(s) 2025.

(see Charbonnel, 2010; Guldin, 2000; Harvey, 2007; Koschorke et al., 2007; Mouton, 2009; Musolff, 2010b; O'Brien, 2018). Due to the lexicalized English phrase *body politic*, which acquired legal constitutional status in early modern England (Genet, 1997; Kantorowicz, 1997; Maitland, 2003), the main research focus has been on the 'Anglo-tradition' of the metaphor but the uptake the late medieval notion of the 'corpus politicum' concept, from which the body politic terminology derived, in other national traditions has also been investigated, including those in Slavic-speaking countries (see Auestad, 2014; Cepinskyte, 2019; Musolff, 2010a, pp. 81–136; Rasulić, 2020; Rutten, 2020; Stanojević, 2019; Weiss, 2020).

Obviously, during this 2500 years encompassing history the metaphor has not stayed one-and-the-same: both its prototypical "source domain" and its "target" applications (Lakoff, 1993) have changed many times over and can also be expected to vary across cultures, according to the tenets of Cultural Linguistics (Sharifian, 2017a, 2017b). But how can we operationalise this general insight? This article draws on a project of eliciting interpretative applications of the metaphor that reveal their present-day understanding among diverse cultural groups of metaphor 'recipients'. To this end, a postgraduate team at the University of East Anglia (Norwich, UK) and I conducted a cross-cultural questionnaire-based survey in 2011–2020, in which we asked students in English-as-Lingua Franca (ELF) Higher Education contexts, to "apply the metaphor of the nation as a body" to their own nation. Overall, we sampled nearly 2100 completed questionnaires at 51 universities in thirty countries; these were reduced to 1772 questionnaires that could be grouped into 24 L1 backgrounds that were compared both qualitatively and quantitatively (Musolff, 2021). In this article, I focus on the findings from that survey for the Slavic L1 samples[1] in a qualitative analysis that discusses their innovative aspects as well as their (partial) groundedness in culture-specific discourse traditions (for quantitative comparisons of the Slavic L1-cohorts see Musolff, 2021, pp. 113–129).

[1] The Slavic-L1 samples were collected with the help of colleagues and students at the following universities in Bulgaria, Croatia, Poland, Russia, Serbia and Ukraine, specifically: St Kliment Ohridsky University in Sofia, University of Rijeka, Universities of Cracow, Łodz and Konin University of Belgrade, Moscow State Linguistic University and the People's Friendship University, and the National Pedagogic Dragomanov University in Kyiv and the Academy of the National Guard in Kharkiv, as well as from programs with Slavic-L1 students at a number of other European universities. To all of them my deeply felt thanks!

2. Methodology

In order to investigate cultural variation, the "Cultural Linguistics" approach modifies the standard versions of "Conceptual Metaphor Theory" (Lakoff, 1993, 2008; Lakoff & Johnson, 2003) so as to cover the whole range of figurative cognition. It distinguishes three levels of "cultural metaphors", "cultural schemas" and "cultural categories", with the "schema" level comprising comprehensive belief/value systems and "categories" referring to lexical sets, e.g., color or kinship categories etc. (Sharifian, 2017a, p. 18, 2017b, p. 5). Cultural metaphors are manifested along a continuum between these two poles. At one end, "worldview metaphors" can approximate whole culture schemas that have quasi-literal status in religious or mythological thought; at the other end are individual creative mappings that lead to the emergence of *ad hoc* categories. The semantics of "cultural metaphors" thus needs an explanation that clarifies its meaning(s) in both directions: vis-à-vis its fit in worldview schemas and vis-à-vis its ad hoc pragmatic role in situational communication contexts.

For the purposes of survey analysis, a further methodological modification was introduced, i.e., the analytical level of "scenario analysis", which takes account of the fact that metaphor production as well as reception data in larger corpora cluster in narrative-argumentative complexes, e.g., for *body* metaphors in *illness-to-recovery* stories and for *person* metaphors in *family relationship* or *social role* stories (Musolff, 2006, 2016, 2021). In this survey we grouped the 2486 metaphor tokens found in the 1772 questionnaires into five main scenarios: A) the nation as a *whole body* (*from head to foot, with limbs and organs, in a state of health or illness*); B) the nation as *part of a larger body* (e.g. as the *heart of Europe*); C) the nation as part of the writers' own bodies (e.g. as *blood flowing through one's veins*); D) as a geo-political body, a *geo-body*[2] (with specific places, e.g. cities or regions as organs); and E) as a *person* (with *individual features, character traits, age, gender and role specifications*). All scenarios were covered in all L1 samples, but with different frequencies (for details see Musolff, 2021), and they also 'collocate' in the sense that a particular source domain may be conceptualized in more than one scenario at the same time. For example, the depiction of a national capital as the *warm heart of its*

[2] The coinage geobody was adopted from Winichakul (1994).

nation-body is *prima facie* a case of scenario D (*geobody*) but can also be construed as a manifestation of the *nation-person's good character* (scenario E).

3. *Body* and *person* scenarios in the Slavic L1 samples

In the Slavic-L1 samples, this scenario collocation works out in such a way that the *geobody* and *part of ego* scenarios (which in other L1-cultures are far more prominent) can be subsumed under *part of body*, as they always collocate with it. This leaves three scenarios, which we will discuss in this section in the order: *whole body, part of body* and *person*. As the numbers of responses diverge widely between the different L1 samples (Russian L1: n=86, Serbian L1: n=59, Ukrainian L1: n=55, Polish-L1: n=25, Croatian L1: n=22 and Bulgarian L1: n=6), most examples discussed below come from the larger samples, but the smaller ones are taken into account as much as possible.

3.1. The nation as a *whole body*

In the Russian L1 sample, the *whole body* scenario is small (9 tokens out of 151) compared with first-ranked *part of body* scenario (75 tokens), which is a characteristic shared only with the Ukrainian L1 sample among the Slavic L1 cohort. This marks a contrast to most Western European scenarios, in which the *head-to-feet* hierarchy of the *whole body* scenario plays the most important role. In the Russian L1 sample, it is restricted to the relationship 'president and government vis-à-vis people' in target domain terms, without differentiation of different social, economic or political institutions:

(1) My nation is Russian. I think that people is the heart as it move the whole body. And the heart is responsible for the emotions. As for the brain (or sense), it's the government as it's responsible for serious decisions.[3]

(2) My home nation is Russian. If we look at is as the human body, then the head would be the people. You might think that it rules the whole body. However, the government is the neck. And the neck moves the head. Unfortunately, people in Russia are under a lot of pressure by the government.

[3] This and all following examples are reproduced verbatim, without additions or corrections. Only omissions are indicated by "[…]".

The (assertive) description of the complementary *heart* and *brain*-functions in the *body politic* in (1) is a stereotypical conceptualization, which can be found across the whole corpus, including all Slavic L1 samples. But as the second example shows, the same scenario can also be used to denounce the nation's current political organization. The writer here assumes that in a functioning democracy the people, as the *head*, should "rule the whole body" but that in present-day Russia they have to follow the orders/*movements* of the government-*neck*. This scenario version derives from an international proverb about marital roles that is found also in the Ukrainian and Polish L1 samples (see below): 'The man/husband is the head of the family but the woman/wife is the neck that turns the head'.[4] Its 'lesson' subverts the stereotypical body hierarchy: the anatomically 'lower' neck determines what the 'higher' head does. In (2), the government is supposed to be lower than the people but still orders it around: this proverb application communicates the writer's skeptical stance on how the political system in Russia works.

In addition to the *hierarchy* perspective, the *interdependency* of all limbs is emphasized:

(3) I think that Russia is a single coordinated organism.

(4) Russia is a complex organism […] Each subject of our country is like a cog in the big mechanism, without it the country will not prosper.

Whilst this emphasis on the interdependence of all *parts in the whole body* is also standard in the corpus, the equation of *body* with *organism* or even *mechanism* in these examples shows a special abstract, quasi-scientific understanding of the *body-whole*. In terms of conceptual history, it comes close to mechanical body models applied to the state, as pioneered by the English 17th century philosopher Thomas Hobbes in his *Leviathan* ([1651], Hobbes, 1996) but there is no explicit reference to Hobbes's theory in the response so a direct provenance cannot be proven.

In the Ukrainian L1 sample, the *whole body* scenario is again not the largest one, with 22 out of 77 tokens, but relatively bigger than in the Russian L1. It shows the usual allocations of organs to political institutions, as in this rather formulaic example:

(5) I think that parliament are its head and I think that the people are the heart, I think that the police are the eyes, I think that the army is hands, I think

[4] The proverb was made popular in the film *My Big Fat Greek Wedding* (2002), see https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g1jD-s_DYFw (Radian, 2014).

that the media is the ears, I think that the population is its leg. I think that the science are light. I think that the president is the neck.

Here (and in one other Ukrainian L1 example[5]) we find again the *neck* (= president) as the source input in a scenario that appears to assume its pre-eminence over other organs, including the *head* (= parliament). Reading it as a tacit allusion to the 'neck-turns head' proverb, this usage might be an implicit criticism of power relationships, as in the Russian L1 example (2) cited above. However, in the absence of any explicit evaluative bias, it could also have a positive polarity in the sense that it is legitimate for the *neck to direct and/or support the head*.

Many of the *whole body* scenarios in the Ukrainian L1 sample, however, include strident criticisms that reference serious *illnesses*:

(6) […] as in every organism there can be a cancer that lets down the whole body […] trying to change cultural legacy as they wish. I hope that once all our deseases [*sic*] will go away and we will be stronger in every part of body.

The target reference for the *cancer* trying "to change cultural legacy" may well be a topical allusion to the struggle about Russian and Ukrainian national identities, which has played out in political discourse since 2014 and the subsequent military confrontations. Its depiction as *cancer* signals the existential threat that this conflict posits to the Ukraine.

In addition to the extreme medical condition of *cancer*, the *hand(s)/finger(s)* serve as sources for negative conceptualizations of corruption that extends right into the *fingernails*:

(7) The hands: official and unofficial local authorities (including mafia groups) […] determine how things ACTUALLY work […] The fingers: people of a "higher social class" who live in main cities. Have certain power in getting things done through connections, favours and bribing […]. The fingernails: people typically from villages, where movements, fashions and values are dictated by the city people (hence direct contact of fingers and nails).

In the Serbian L1 sample, the *whole body* scenario is by far the largest, with 53 out of 84 tokens. It is also highly differentiated, with 49 concepts, eleven of which concern health-*conditions*. The main conceptual source complexes are the functional units of *head-brain* (57 tokens), *arms-hands* (34), *legs-feet* (29) and *heart-blood* (26), but some other organs are also relatively frequently

[5] "Our authority may be the head, but people will always stay the neck."

mentioned: *eyes* (13), *mouth* (10) and *ears* (8). The perspectives of hierarchy and of the interdependence of *body parts/organs* are both highlighted, with mainly the president or the government as the *head* and the people as the *heart*:

(8) The nation leader is head of body. Every decision leader made, have influence on whole body. Arms of body are all organisation that are important for national economy. The most important part of body is heart. That heart are people.

Society-stabilizing institutions such as industry, the work force, hospitals and the school system are likewise linked to stereotypical source equivalents, such as *spine*, *back*, *shoulders*, *torso*. Criticism of state and/or society is expressed in three main ways: a) by substituting negatively charged target concepts, e.g., "corruption, lies and wrong beliefs" as Serbia's *backbone*, *brain* and *heart*, and the 'talking' but inefficient parts of the state-apparatus as *mouth* and *lips*; b) allocations of stereotypical useless or low/taboo body parts to 'problem aspects' of the nation, e.g., *appendix* ("not useful for anything") to the government and *colon* to the "poor ones and homeless"; c) illness-concepts, e.g., the nation as being a *cripple*, *in a wheelchair*, *blind*, *deaf*, *infected*, or *having a headache*.

In the Polish L1 sample, the *whole body scenario* is even more dominant than in the Serbian L1 sample, with 24 out of a total of 32 scenario tokens. It highlights both the hierarchical ordering and functionality of the *body parts* in the top-down ordering: *head/face* (= president, prime minister, government), *brain* (= prime minister, parliament), *neck* (= prime minister, "turning the *head* [president]"), *heart* (= government, people), *eyes* (= president, intelligence agencies), *mouth* (= government), *arms*, *right/left hand* (= prime minister or other ministers [vis-à-vis president]), *legs* (= courts, citizens), *nerve system* (= administration), *stomach* (= government), *gall bladder* (= president, viewed as "not having much power, but nothing will happen without him"), *broken teeth in country's oral cavity* (= army).

As references to the *neck that turns the head* and the use of concepts of 'lower-ranking' organs such as *stomach* and *gall bladder* indicate, Polish respondents are not averse to using critical or ironical interpretations. Just two target topics seem to be exempt from such treatment and are instead proudly praised: a) the nation's *recovery* from dictatorship and occupation ("Body and mind didn´t work together properly […] that's why it has been *seriously ill at least two times*") and b), the Catholic church ("Catholic Church can be perceived as a *heart of our country*"). These positively charged scenarios fit well

with Poland's representation in the government-sponsored "catholic-nationalist discourse" (Gomola, 2019), which was highly influential in Poland at the time of data collection in 2017–2019.

Due to their small sizes, the Croatian and Bulgarian L1 samples have only a few whole *body scenario* instances (8 and 4 respectively). In the Croatian L1 sample, the president is allocated *head* status, and the people are the *heart*.

In the Bulgarian L1 sample all of the *whole body* instances collocate with the *person* scenario and will therefore be treated in section 3.3.

3.2. The nation as a *body part*, *geobody* and *part of ego*

Body part is the most frequently used scenario in the Russian L1 sample (with 75 tokens out of 151); it is also the collocate of *all* instantiations of the *geobody* and *part of ego* scenarios; so they are treated here together. The central concept of a *body part* employed to depict Russia is the *heart*:

(9) Russia is like heart. Heart is a unique, the most important organ for all living beings. It's a well-known fact that without normal functioning of heart life is impossible. It is the most powerful part of people's bodies. Russia is the most powerful country for me, I believe in its further development and wish it only good!

(10) Russia is like heart burning with passion. At a first glance Russian people seem to be cold and reserved but deep down you understand it is not so. […]. Russia, like heart, is constantly working or beating to develop further to become better. And if it stops (I mean Russia) don't you think that the world will be deprived of something valuable?

The conceptualization of the nation as a *heart* provides the focus of many Russian informants' political identification. Relying on the *topos* of Russian national identity as characterized by its emotions, the *heart* concept aligns the *part of body*, *part of ego* and *person* scenarios: e.g., "in my life […] Russia is *like my 'heart'*"; "*Russia is like my* […] *people's heart, which is so kind*"; *Heart* is a key-concept in the Russian L1 sample, not just as the most central and most important organ but also as the seat of positive emotions e.g. "*bravery, courage and kindness*" [6], and as a synonym for the essence of Russia, i.e. its *soul*:

[6] The only exception is a depiction of *Russia-as-heart* as *seat of sadness*: "Russia is like a broken heart because there are so many sad people around me", without further explanation.

(11) […] the basis of our country is the Russian soul. It is the broad, warm and kind heart of our country.

(12) In my opinion Russia is like a heart. Russia is the soul of humanity.

Apart from *heart/soul*, a wide range of the most commonly familiar organs and limbs is also used to praise the nation: *brain* ("observes all the situation in the world. It can make up a different solutions of dead-end problems"); *neck*: ("where neck turns, there head turns. Russia is a big country and it has an influence on other countries", i.e. another assertive, non-ironical application of the *head-neck* proverb); *blood* ("Russia is like a veins […] it occupies a big territory, spreading through the continent"); *ears* ("listening very attentively to the world"); *back* ("covers and protect weak countries from the outside problems"; "there is a heavy bag on the back of the world"), *spine* ("*supports* the whole world"); *arms* ("Russia's arms can work hard […]. If they like you, they will hug you so sweet and warm. If you treat them bad they defenetly [*sic*] will punch you hard"; "My country as my arms helps me in many heavy situations"); *hand* ("Russia is like a hand. To be precise, on the right hand. This hand can be as hard as it is to beat the enemies ort stifle the dissenters, so soft to help the needy"); *legs* ("this country strongly stays 'on its feet' for many centuries, even world wars couldn't 'strike it down'"); *skin* ("largest human organ", relating to Russia's vast *geobody*); *lungs*: ("which helps the planet to breach" [*sic*, intended word: breathe]); *liver* ("involved in every process even though it might not want to take part in them. It also gets all the damage trying to cure the whole 'body'"); *guts* ("due to its vast expanses"); *hair* ("If you look at Russia from space, you will see that almost all territory is covered with forests. […]. It creates special mood such as a hairstyle").

The inventiveness in the selection of a *tertium comparationis* for nation-as-*body part* concepts shows that some informants engaged creatively with the questionnaire task so as to find 'interesting' as well as entertaining insights into characteristic traits of their nation. Such a playful approach obviously differs from expressing convictions about the essence of the Russian *heart-soul* identity, as exemplified earlier. Both types of responses are, however, similar in that they generally serve to eulogize the nation. This assertive stance on the part of Russian respondents is underlined by the fact that the (few) instances of criticism are humorous-ironical, rather than wholly negative:

(13) My home is like a spleen. It aches but it is still a part of you, no matter what.

(14) Russia is like a mouth full of bright shiny and dirty old teeth. Basically, all the dirty ones make life a living nightmare for all the new ones. We also have a tongue that keeps swallowing all the truth as a type pf media […] If you wanna take care of your teeth and tongue, you need to buy a brush and brush'em [*sic*] everyday.

As in the Russian L1 example, Ukrainian conceptualizations of the nation as a *body part* (22 out of 77 altogether) are almost always praising the nation, e.g. as *heart* ("*big as heart of the mother*"; "*heart* of the universe"), *head* ("our nation is like *a human's head* […] very democratic"),[7] *hands* and *arms* ("keep us together", "looking for something new"), *back* ("allows us moving"), and even *oesophagus* ("it saturates all organ nutrients"). The *heart* is also viewed by Ukrainian respondents as the seat of the *soul*, but with a significant difference to the Russian L1 sample: emotions or emotionality are never mentioned, not even in its collocations with the *part of ego* scenario in the Ukrainian L1 sample; what matters most is identity:

(15) My nation is my soul
(16) […] country is like a heart and soul
(17) We are as one […], one soul

The few negatively evaluated *body part* conceptualizations, e.g. *stomach* and *appendix*, are mostly formulated as general observations, i.e., they do not target specifically the Ukraine (e.g., "Nation with bad people is like *stomach with digestion problems*"; "nations that almost not exist now, we can compare them with appendix). There is, however, one *body part*-based reference to the topical conflict of Ukraine v. Russia (coded as 'West v. East'), which conveys a similar message as example (6) from the *whole body* scenario:

(18) My nation is the stomach of divided nations. It has to digest the conflicts. The heart of it is split between East and West but the mind is still stucked [*sic*] in Eastern doctrines.

In the Serbian L1 sample, *part of body* and *part of ego* scenarios are only marginally represented. In three out of its altogether 4 instances, a *part of body* is used to discuss the general concept of 'nation' as *head*, *brain* or *heart*. *Part of ego* is once invoked as the *brain*, referring to the ('ignored") class of intellectuals. The *geobody* scenario (6 tokens) includes 4 tokens that refer to

[7] Outside the *body part* scenario, *head* and *heart*, as well as *eyes*, also serve as *geobody* concepts with reference to the capital Kyiv.

the autonomous, multi-ethnic region of Kosovo, which declared independence from Serbia in 2008, as still being the Serbian nation's *heart*, or a *wounded limb* (in danger of amputation) or a *crucified body*:

(19) Kosovo is commonly reffered as the heart of Serbia

(20) The lungs are huge woods in the central part of SERBIA called Sumadija, arms are the connection that we have with other countries and the heart is KOSOVO.

(21) […] the loss of the territory of Kosovo […] is sometimes described as "crucified"- "raspeto Kosovo".

(22) One of our legs got broken a long time ago, and it still hasn´t healed. Others wanna [*sic*] force it to amputation, […] Those people aren´t doctors and have no idea what they are trying to do, and Serbia will not lose its leg, because it is still a part of Serbia´s body.

The depiction of Kosovo as Serbia's *heart* in examples (20), (21) and of its damaged status (22, 23) expresses the Serbian nationalist perspective that it still belongs to the core of Serbia's *geobody*. The historical background to this view is the narrative that Kosovo was at the center of the medieval Serbian Empire and was lost to the Ottomans in the "Battle of Kosovo" in (1389). This 'sacrifice' has been invoked by modern religious and political leaders up to the present day (Spasić, 2016).[8]

In the Polish L1 sample, the scenarios of *body part, geobody* and *part of ego* together only account for 5 instances. Of these, one *body part* (or rather, *body feature*) instance stands out:[9]

(23) Our nation wants to be seen as thick-skinned. We are not a pimple of the world.

Taken literally, this negated *pimple* characterization makes little sense but as an ironical-defensive rejection of dismissive attitudes of outsiders, it serves to express a 'hurt pride' stance. Being *a pimple of the world* would imply a ridiculously low status among nations, whereas being *thick-skinned* conveys an image of self-reliance and imperviousness to foreign criticism.

[8] Less controversially, the capital Belgrade is also twice identified as the Serbian *heart*, which conforms to the conventional use of the *geobody* scenario.

[9] The other *body part* instance refers to Poland as *brain*, the 2 *geobody* scenarios refer to Warsaw as the heart of the nation and the one *part of ego* instance describes "Christian values and traditions as being "in our roots and as our legs", conforming with the "catholic-nationalist discourse" (Gomola, 2019), noted earlier.

In the Croatian L1 sample, the most important *body-part* concept, with 15 instances, is again *heart*, which collocates with *geobody*, by targeting the capital, Zagreb (6 instances),[10] or symbolizing the generous character of the nation:

(24) My nation have open heart to other people.[11]

3.3. The nation as a *person*

In the Russian L1 sample, the *person* scenario is the second most frequent scenario with 44 tokens. The most frequent concepts in the semantic field of person(ality) include the character traits *kindness-love-helpfulness* (21 instances) and *soul* (9 instances). Gendered conceptualizations are few and far between. The four depictions of Russia as a male figure emphasize macho qualities: *broad shoulders*, *independence*, *bad manners*, *at least superficially*, ("rude in crowd but kind and simple in close conversation") and *strength*.[12] There are just two depictions of Russia as *mother* and one as *(grand-)mother*. The scarcity of mother-conceptualizations is surprising in view of the fact that there is a tradition of patriotic symbolism of *Mother Russia*, with an associated phraseology of the terms *motherland* and *Mother Russia* (Cepinskyte, 2019). Indeed, the term *motherland* appears twice in the corpus (in addition to the three above-mentioned *mother* personifications) but is not elaborated upon or attributed specific feelings or character traits. One possible explanation is that for the respondents the *kindness-love-helpfulness* concepts tacitly implied a female-gendered personalization, so the latter did not need to be spelt out as well. When the *(Grand-)Mother Russia* figure was invoked, this character-attribution was clearly foregrounded:

(25) Russia […] protects weak [countries] similarly steadfastly as mom defends her child.

(26) Russia is like a heart of an old grandmother. […] when you get to know her better she turns out to be very emotional caring.

[10] The other 2 *geobody/body part* instances refer to forests as *lungs* and the region of "Slavonija" as the *belly* of Croatia.

[11] As in other L1 samples, the 'generosity' meaning of *open heart* can alternatively be expressed as *open arms*.

[12] The *man* Russia is also once depicted as "Serbia's *elder brother*.

The identification of the nation-*mother* with the emotions of *love*, *kindness*, *helpfulness*, which are located in the *heart* links up with the concept of the Russian soul, which is also in or even identical with the *heart* (see sections 3.1, 3.2). The *heart-soul-motherly kindness* complex thus forms a system of *body/person* conceptualizations of a national character that serves as a focus for personal identification and trust.

There is one exceptional example of personalization that has overtones of literary associations (Gogol, *The Overcoat*; Dostoevsky, *The Double*, *Poor Folk*), i.e., the depiction of Russia as a disempowered *clerk*:

(27) If I imagined Russia and our nation in terms of a human body, I would present you the ordinary clerk and his body. The clerk […] has a potential, overtasked brains and unlimited ambitions, but he has a big percentage of bad habits too. Every day he sleeps for 4-5 hours, because he doesn't know how to organize his time correctly and rationally. That is why he loses at one a big part of his aptitude, because he can't work at full capacity without due rest and organization. Moreover, his lungs are burned by cigarettes and exhaust fumes, his brain is exhausted by regular stresses. He was tired out and doesn't see the point of his life. […] Russia is the clerk, cigarettes and exhaust fumes is corruption, regular stresses and irrational organization of time is incompetence of government and cyclical crises. Russia has a big potential, but doesn't have the right arrangement of work.

The writer, a 17 year old female student, draws the picture of a promising but badly organized and stressed out male office worker. He is presented as being the victim of his own disorientation. The lesson to be drawn could be an appeal to lead a more disciplined and purposeful life, but without an explicit disambiguation in the response it remains unclear whether this is meant as a political or moral demand (or both).

In the Ukrainian L1 sample, personalization is rare: it has just 10 tokens altogether, spread across eight concepts, most of which appear only once. They include three gendered conceptualizations, i.e., *girl* (1 instance) and *mother* (2) and the character traits, *courage in fighting*, *good organization*, *athleticism*, *industriousness* and *togetherness*; the last of these is linked to the Ukrainian nation's *soul*, which, as commented on before, is distinct from the emotion-laden Russian concept. Rather than 'deep' feelings it emphasizes unity and solidarity:

(28) […] nation defends our mind and soul.

(29) "Nation" is like a soul, which feels all around.

Of the total 21 person conceptualizations in the Serbian L1 sample, 18 collocate with the *whole body* scenario in a highly characteristic way: they merge the *head* concept, used to refer the country's president, A. Vučić and his government, with that of *person*, both for praise ("takes decisions", "considers options", "powerful and capable") and for criticism ("has headache", "has split personality", "doesn't quite well respond on every situation", "should help us to move our body, […] but helps other body parts like financial part"). This identification of nation-*person*, *head* and a specific politician is unique in the whole corpus.

The Polish L1 sample has only three tokens of *person* scenarios, one of which refers to the national language as the nation's *soul*; one collocates with *body part* by insisting on not being "a pimple of the world" (example 23 above), and one depicts the nation in a highly original way as a kind of *bipolar female person* who defends her independence:

(30) My home nation is like a beautiful woman that mind changes one hundred times in a minute. On the one hand it is sweet, lovable and huggable and on the other hand it is annoying, screaming and fighting for no particular reason. However, sometimes it fights for its crucial rights and it is fantastic that she never gives up.

The 'personal traits' of the Croatian nation-*person* are divided into two sets: *heroic/firm/brave* and *generous/big-hearted*. Gendered personalizations are just two instances of the nation as *father* and four of it as *young woman/girl*. The referents of the *father* concept are nationalist politicians, i.e. in one case the founder of Croatian nationalism in the 19th century, Ante Starčević (1823–1896), and, in the other case, the founders of the post-1990 Croatian state as "founding fathers" who "fought with all bravery and marked with their legs to free our country". The feminine-gendered personalizations of the Croatian nation include stereotyping clichés (*blue eyes*, *pure heart*, *beautiful*), except for one interpretation that combines a linguistic explanation of her name with a folkloristic *geobody* scenario:

(31) Croatia is usually perceived as a woman, which might have to do with the grammatical category of gender (Hrvatska (Croatian name for Croatia) -> is feminine). […] her eyes are the color of the sea (Adriatic Sea), her hair is the gold color of the wheat (Eastern part which is agricultural); her strength is the strength of the mountains (hilly middle part).

The small Bulgarian L1 sample has nine scenario instances overall: four each for *whole body* and *person* collocate with each other and in one case

with *part of ego*; and there are one each for the other scenarios. Similarly to the Ukrainian L1-sample, they serve to either emphasize the necessity of a unity of national *body* and *spirit*, or bemoan the lack of it, in either case aligning *body* and *person*:

(32) […] our nation has got many ill parts or such that do not function properly, which leads to total society dysfunction.

(33) Our nation is like our body, our soul embed is the collective mindset of our society and the each of us is part of the body, which is the society considered as a whole.

Overall, the *person* scenario is used by the informants of the Slavic L1 samples to produce many individualized depictions of the national *body politic*, with a higher degree of collocation and, generally, of figurative creativity than that expressed by the other scenarios. This is a common feature across most L1 samples in the corpus, most probably due to the wider range of "source" experience.

4. Conclusions

The overview of *nation-as-body* metaphor scenarios in Slavic L1 samples shows that there is no consistent, let alone homogeneous way in which they apply this metaphor and that characteristic usage patterns appear at the level of national political cultures. Thus, the Russian and Ukrainian L1 samples showed similarities in highlighting the importance of *heart* and *soul* as the innermost core of national identity, but differed in defining the latter as the *seat of ('motherly') emotions* (Russian L1) or as the *core of national unity* (to protect against internal cultural conflict). The Serbian L1 sample stood out on account of defining a *geo-body*-external region as its symbolic center of identity, the *heart* (on account of its historic significance). The three smaller samples, i.e., Polish L1, Croatian L1 and Bulgarian L1, did not provide sufficient data to confirm recurrent source scenarios, but they still gave an indication of national concerns: the need to defend the nation's status from outside arrogance (*not a pimple* and religious identity in the Polish L1 sample; ambition to achieve an ideal congruence of *geobody* with national identity (Croatian L1) and of *body* and *soul* (Bulgarian L1). They thus show how figurative scenarios can fill schematic mappings with concrete situated mini-narratives that provide platforms for identification and practical/pragmatic stances in political discourse.

Due to the significantly different sizes of the national samples and the lack of quantitative comparison, these results are only of indicative value in terms of corpus-based metaphor studies but they clearly show semantic and pragmatic variation, both at the level of socio-cultural stereotypes and at the level of individual creativity. In each L1 sample there were at least some respondents who applied/interpreted the *nation-as-body* metaphor in a highly original, often critical or ironical way, to signal a special conception of the target domain and its connotative and emotional aspects which often relating to personal experiences of or stances towards national identities. The standard metaphor scenarios (*whole body*, *geobody*, *part of body*, *part of ego*, *person*) as used in the Slavic L1 discourse communities thus reveal insights into the narratives in which the respondents portray their nations' destinies and their own place in them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Auestad, L. (Ed.). (2014). *Nationalism and the body politic*. Karnac Books.

Cepinskyte, A. (2019). The meaning of state created through symbols and metaphors: German *Heimat* and Russian *Motherland*. In L. Šarić & M.-M. Stanojević (Eds.), *Metaphor, nation and discourse* (pp. 177–200). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.82.08cep

Charbonnel, N. (2010). *Comme un seul homme: Corps politique et corps mystique* (Vols. 1–2). Aréopage.

Genet, J.-P. (1997). Kantorowicz and the *King's two bodies*: A non contextual history. In R. L. Benson & J. Fried (Eds.), *Ernst Kantorowicz* (pp. 265–273). Franz Steiner.

Gomola, A. (2019). Godly Poland in godless Europe: Catholic-nationalist discourse in Poland after 2004. In L. Šarić & M.-M. Stanojević (Eds.), *Metaphor, nation and discourse* (pp. 75–100). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.82.04gom

Guldin, R. (2000). *Metaphors of multilingualism: Changing attitudes towards language diversity in literature, linguistics and philosophy*. Routledge.

Harvey, A. D. (2007). *Body politic: Political metaphor and political violence*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Hobbes, T. (1996). *Leviathan* (R. Tuck, Ed.; Rev. ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Kantorowicz, E. H. (1997). *The king's two bodies: A study in mediaeval political theology* (7th paperback print). Princeton University Press.

Koschorke, A., Lüdemann, S., Frank, T., & Matala de Mazza, E. (2007). *Der fiktive Staat: Konstruktionen des politischen Körpers in der Geschichte Europas*. Fischer.

Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (2nd ed., pp. 202–251). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173865.013

Lakoff, G. (2008). The neural theory of metaphor. In R. W. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 17–38). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511816802.003

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by* (Rev. ed.). University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226470993.001.0001

Maitland, F. W. (2003). *State, trust and corporation* (D. Runciman & M. Ryan, Eds.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511810435

Mouton, N. T. O. (2009). *On the evolution of social scientific metaphors: A cognitive-historical inquiry into the divergent trajectories of the idea that collective entities – states and societies, cities and corporations – are biological organisms* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Copenhagen Business School.

Musolff, A. (2006). Metaphor scenarios in public discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol, 21*(1), 23–38. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms2101_2

Musolff, A. (2010a). *Metaphor, nation and the Holocaust: The concept of the body politic*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203847282

Musolff, A. (2010b). Political metaphor and *bodies politic*. In U. Okulska & P. Cap (Eds.), *Perspectives in politics and discourse* (pp. 23–41). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.36.05mus

Musolff, A. (2016). *Political metaphor analysis: Discourse and scenarios*. Bloomsbury.

Musolff, A. (2021). *National conceptualisations of the body politic: Cultural experience and political imagination*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-8740-5

O'Brien, G. V. (2018). *Contagion and the national body: The organism metaphor in American thought*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315141633

Radian, R. (2014, February 9). *The head and the neck – My big fat Greek wedding CJbC5AfxqPc* [Video]. YouTube. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g1jD-s_DYFw

Rasulić, K. (2020). Turning the heart into a neighbor: (Re)framing Kosovo in Serbian political discourse. In M. Huang & L.-L. Holmgreen (Eds.), *The language of crisis: Metaphors, frames and discourses* (pp. 111–135). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.87.04ras

Rutten, E. (2020). *Unattainable bride Russia: Gendering nation, state, and intelligentsia in Russian intellectual culture*. Northwestern University Press.

Sharifian, F. (2017a). *Cultural linguistics: Cultural conceptualisations and language*. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/clscc.8

Sharifian, F. (2017b). Cultural linguistics: The state of the art. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *Advances in cultural linguistics* (pp. 1–28). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-4056-6_1

Spasić, I. (2016). The trauma of Kosovo in Serbian national narratives. In R. Eyerman, J. C. Alexander, & E. Butler Breese (Eds.), *Narrating trauma: On the impact of collective suffering* (pp. 81–106). Routledge.

Stanojević, M.-M. (2019). Metaphorical and non-metaphorical dimensions of the term *nacija* in Croatian online discourse. In L. Šarić & M.-M. Stanojević (Eds.), *Metaphor, nation and discourse* (pp. 259–286). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.82.11sta

Weiss, D. (2020). The Ukrainian nation – stepmother, younger sister or stillborn baby? Evidence from Russian TV debates and related political sources (2013–2015). In N. Knoblock (Ed.), *Language of conflict: Discourses of the Ukrainian crisis* (pp. 117–135). Bloomsbury. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350098633.0011

Winichakul, T. (1994). *Siam mapped: A history of the geo-body of a nation*. University of Hawai'i Press.

Dusza narodu a macierzyństwo. Konceptualizacje państwa jako ciała lub osoby w anglojęzycznych (ALF) odpowiedziach natywnych użytkowników języków słowiańskich

Jedną z kluczowych metafor w konceptualizacji tożsamości narodowej jest naród jako ciało lub osoba. Ucieleśnienie i personalizacja narodu są obecne w historii pojęć ponad dwa tysiąclecia i nadal zajmują ważne miejsce we współczesnym dyskursie politycznym. Zarówno domena docelowa, jak i źródłowa uległy znacznym przeobrażeniom na przestrzeni czasu, co rodzi pytanie, w jakim sensie omawiana metafora pozostała tożsama. Nowe dowody (pochodzące z badania interpretacyjnego przeprowadzonego w 30 krajach w latach 2011–2020) sugerują, że ta metafora konceptualna funkcjonuje na dwóch poziomach, tj. 1) abstrakcyjnego ogólnego mapowania i 2) pragmatycznie wzbogaconych „scenariuszy" które prowadzą do kreatywnych zastosowań. Jako dowód na istnienie takich scenariuszy w artykule przedstawiono dane z prób ankietowych wśród użytkowników języków słowiańskich, które ilustrują wzajemne oddziaływanie na siebie mapowania baz doświadczeniowych i innowacyjnych aspektów znaczeniowych, które są zakorzenione w specyficznych dla danej kultury tradycjach dyskursywnych.

Słowa kluczowe: ciało polityczne; lingwistyka kulturowa; metafora; scenariusz; języki słowiańskie

The nation's soul and motherhood: Conceptualizations of the state as a body or person in Slavic L1-ELF responses

One of the key-metaphors in conceptualizing national identity is that of the nation as a *body* or a *person*. Nation-embodiment and -personalization have had a long conceptual history spanning more than two millennia and still figure prominently in present-day political discourse. Both the target and source-domains have changed considerably over time, so it may be asked in which sense the metaphor has remained the same. New evidence from an interpretation

survey conducted in 30 countries in 2011–2020 suggests that this conceptual metaphor functions at two levels, i.e., 1) an abstract general mapping and 2) pragmatically enriched "scenarios" that lead to creative applications. As evidence for such scenarios, the article presents data from Slavic L1 survey samples that illustrate the interplay between the matrix mappings and innovative meaning aspects that are grounded in culture-specific discourse traditions.

Keywords: body politic; cultural linguistics; metaphor; scenario; Slavic languages

Andreas Musolff (A.Musolff@uea.ac.uk) – emerytowany profesor Uniwersytetu Wschodniej Anglii (Norwich, Wielka Brytania). Jego zainteresowania badawcze koncentrują się na badaniu dyskursu publicznego, pragmatyce języka figuratywnego i komunikacji międzykulturowej. Ostatnie publikacje książkowe obejmują monografie: *National Conceptualisations of the Body Politic: Cultural Experience and Political Imagination* [Narodowe konceptualizacje ciała politycznego. Doświadczenie kulturowe i wyobraźnia polityczna; 2021] oraz *Political Metaphor Analysis: Discourse and Scenarios* [Analiza metafor politycznych. Dyskursy i scenariusze, 2016], a także tomy współredagowane *Pandemic and Crisis Discourse: Communicating COVID-19 Public Health Strategy* [Pandemia i dyskurs kryzysowy. Komunikowanie strategii zdrowia publicznego COVID-19; 2022] oraz *Migration and Media: Discourses about Identities in Crisis* [Migracja i media. Dyskursy o tożsamościach w kryzysie; 2019].

Andreas Musolff (A.Musolff@uea.ac.uk) – professor emeritus at the University of East Anglia (Norwich, UK). His research interests focus on the study of public discourse, the pragmatics of figurative language and intercultural communication. His recent book publications include the monographs *National Conceptualisations of the Body Politic: Cultural Experience and Political Imagination* (2021), and *Political Metaphor Analysis: Discourse and Scenarios* (2016) and the co-edited volumes *Pandemic and Crisis Discourse: Communicating COVID-19 Public Health Strategy* (2022) and *Migration and Media: Discourses about Identities in Crisis* (2019).

Publication History: Received: 2024-04-12; Accepted: 2024-05-31; Published: 2025-06-26