ISSN 1392-8295

mokslo darbai transactions

RESPECTUS PHILOLOGICUS

2016 Nr. 29 (34)

RESPECTUS PHILOLOGICUS Nr. 29 (34)

MOKSLINIS TĘSTINIS LEIDINYS

Leidžia Vilniaus universiteto Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas ir Jano Kochanovskio universiteto Humanitarinis fakultetas Kielcuose du kartus per metus (balandžio 25 d. ir spalio 25 d.).

Leidinyje lietuvių, lenkų, anglų, rusų kalbomis skelbiami originalūs moksliniai straipsniai, atitinkantys svarbiausias fakultetų humanitarinių mokslinių tyrimų kryptis: lingvistinius tyrinėjimus, literatūros naratyvų ir kontekstų problematiką, reklamos diskurso paveikumą, vertimo teoriją ir praktiką.

CZASOPISMO NAUKOWE

Wydawcy: Uniwersytet Wileński – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie oraz Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kielcach. Ukazuje się dwa razy w roku: 25 kwietnia i 25 października.
W czasopiśmie, w językach litewskim, polskim, angielskim i rosyjskim, zamieszczane są oryginalne artykuły naukowe, których tematyka odzwierciedla najważniejsze kierunki badań prowadzonych na wydziałach humanistycznych współpracujących uczelni: badania językoznawcze i literaturoznawcze wraz z ich kontekstami, badania nad reklamą oraz nad teorią i praktyką przekładu.

ONGOING ACADEMIC PUBLICATION

Published twice a year (April 25, October 25) by Vilnius University Kaunas Faculty of Humanities and The Jan Kochanovski University Faculty of Humanities in Kielce.

The periodical publishes original scholarly articles written in English, Lithuanian, Polish and Russian that correspond to the main humanitarian research fields of the faculties: linguistic researches, issues of literary narratives and contexts, influence of advertising discourse, theory and practice of translation.

DUOMENŲ BAZĖS / BAZY DANYCH / ABSTRACTING AND INDEXING

Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek (2002)	Frei zugängliche E-Journals Universitätsbibliothek Regensburg
Arianta (2002)	Naukowe i branżowe polskie czasopisma elektroniczne
Balcan Rusistics (2004)	Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Śląskiego Russian Language, Literature and Cultural Studies
C.E.E.O.L. (2005)	Central and Eastern European Online Library DFG Nationallizenzen
EBSCO (2006)	Humanities International Complete Humanities Source Current Abstracts Humanities International Index TOC Premier
MLA (2007)	Modern Language Association International Bibliography
Index Copernicus (2008)	Index Copernicus International Journal Master List
Lituanistika (2011)	The Database of the Humanities and Social Sciences in Lithuania
PNB (2011)	Polska Bibiliografia Naukowa
MIAR (2011)	Information Matrix for the Analysis of Journals
Linguistic Bibliography Online (2012)	BrillOnline Bibliographies, Netherlands
Ulrichs (2013)	Ulrich's Periodicals

PATIKRA / WERYFIKACJA / VERIFICATION cross check Powered by iThenticate

REDAKCIJOS ADRESAS / ADRES REDAKCJI / EDITORIAL OFFICE

Vilniaus universitetas	Vilnius University	Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego
Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas	Kaunas Faculty of Humanities	Wydział Humanistyczny
Muitinės g. 8	Muitines 8	ul. Świętokrzyska 21D
LT-44280 Kaunas	LT-44280 Kaunas	25-406 Kielce
Lietuva	Lithuania	Polska

Straipsnius ir kitą mokslinę medžiagą prašome siųsti į žurnalo redakciją Kaune, taip pat el. paštu.
Articles and other scientific material send to the Editorial Office in Kaunas, as well as by e-mail.
Artykuły i inne materiały przeznaczone do publikacji prosimy nadsyłać na adres redakcji w Kownie, także pocztą elektroniczną.

El. paštas / E-mail respectus.philologicus@khf.vu.lt ***Tel***. +370 37 750 536
Interneto svetainė / Strona internetowa / Homepage http://www.rephi.khf.vu.lt

REDAKTORIAI / REDAKCJA / EDITORS

Gabija Bankauskaitė-Sereikienė (lietuvių kalba / język litewski / Lithuanian language)
Beata Piasecka (lenkų kalba / język polski / Polish language)
Brigita Brasienė (anglų kalba / język angielski / English language)
Alla Diomidova (rusų kalba / język rosyjski / Russian language)

Print ISSN 1392-8295, Online ISSN 2335-2388
© Vilniaus universiteto Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas, 2016
© Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kielcach, 2016

RESPECTUS PHILOLOGICUS Nr. 29 (34)

REDAKCINĖ KOLEGIJA – KOLEGIUM REDAKCYJNE EDITORIAL BOARD

Vyriausioji redaktorė – redaktor naczelny – editor-in-chief

Gabija BANKAUSKAITĖ-SEREIKIENĖ
gabija.sereikiene@khf.vu.lt
Vilniaus universiteto profesorė, dr., Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego, dr, Litwa
Professor, Vilnius University, Lithuania

Vyriausiosios redaktorės pavaduotojas – zastępca redaktora naczelnego – deputy editor-in-chief

Marek RUSZKOWSKI
gustaw1960@op.pl
Jano Kochanovskio universiteto Kielcuose profesorius, habil. dr., Lenkija
Profesor Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach, dr hab., Polska
Professor, Jan Kochanovski University in Kielce, Poland

Vyriausiosios redaktorės pavaduotoja – zastępca redaktora naczelnego – deputy editor-in-chief

Loreta ULVYDIENĖ
loreta.ulvydiene@khf.vu.lt
Vilniaus universiteto profesorė, dr., Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego, dr, Litwa
Professor, Vilnius University, Lithuania

Daiva ALIŪKAITĖ
daiva.aliukaite@khf.vu.lt
Vilniaus universiteto docentė, dr., Lietuva
Docent Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego, dr, Litwa
Associate Professor, Vilnius University, Lithuania

Danutė BALŠAITYTĖ
dbalsaityte@gmail.com
Vilniaus universiteto profesorė, dr., Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego, dr, Litwa
Professor, Vilnius University, Lithuania

Wiesław CABAN
caban@ujk.kielce.pl
Jano Kochanovskio universiteto Kielcuose profesorius, habil. dr., Lenkija
Profesor Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach, dr hab., Polska
Professor, Jan Kochanovski University in Kielce, Poland

Renato CORSETTI
renato.corsetti@gmail.com
Romos universiteto „La Sapienza“ profesorius, habil. dr., Italija
Profesor Uniwersytetu Rzymskiego „La Sapienza”, dr hab., Włochy
Professor, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy

Anatolij CHUDINOV
ap_chudinov@mail.ru
Uralo valstybinio pedagoginio universiteto profesorius, dr., Rusija
Profesor Uralskiego Państwowego Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego, dr, Rosja
Professor, Ural State Pedagogical University, Russia

Janusz DETKA
januszdetka1@wp.pl
Jano Kochanovskio universiteto Kielcuose profesorius, habil. dr., Lenkija
Profesor Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach, dr hab., Polska
Professor, Jan Kochanovski University in Kielce, Poland

Margarita GAVRILINA
gavril@inbox.lv
Latvijos universiteto profesorė, dr., Latvija
Profesor Uniwersytetu Łotewskiego w Rydze, dr, Łotwa
Professor, University of Latvia, Latvia

Jonė GRIGALIŪNIENĖ
jone.grigaliuniene@gmail.com
Vilniaus universiteto profesorė, dr., Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego, dr, Litwa
Professor, Vilnius University, Lithuania

Laima KALĖDIENĖ
kaledienei@gmail.com
Mykolo Romerio universiteto profesorė, dr., Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Michała Römera, dr, Litwa
Professor, Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

Asta KAZLAUSKIENĖ
a.kazlauskiene@hmf.vdu.lt
Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto profesorė, dr., Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Witolda Wielkiego, dr, Litwa
Professor (04H), Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

Aleksandras KRASNOVAS
aleksandras.krasnovas@khf.vu.lt
Vilniaus universiteto profesorius, dr., Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego, dr, Litwa
Professor, Vilnius University, Lithuania

Jadvyga KRŪMINIENĖ
jadvyga.kruminiene@khf.vu.lt
Vilniaus universiteto profesorė, dr., Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego, dr, Litwa
Professor, Vilnius University, Lithuania

Kazimierz LUCIŃSKI
ifs@ujk.edu.pl
Jano Kochanovskio universiteto Kielcuose profesorius, habil. dr., Lenkija
Profesor Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach, dr hab., Polska
Professor, Jan Kochanovski University in Kielce, Poland

Lidia MICHALSKA-BRACHA
lidia.bracha@ujk.edu.pl
Jano Kochanovskio universiteto Kielcuose profesorė, habil. dr., Lenkija
Profesor Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach, dr hab., Polska
Professor, Jan Kochanovski University in Kielce, Poland

Gerald E. MIKKELSON
gemikk@ku.edu
Kanzaso universiteto profesorius, dr., JAV
Profesor Uniwersytetu w Kansas, dr, USA
Professor, The University of Kansas, USA

Olegas POLIAKOVAS
oleg.poljakov@flf.vu.lt
Vilniaus universiteto profesorius, dr., Lietuva
Profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego, dr, Litwa
Professor, Vilnius University, Lithuania

Adriana SERBAN
adriana.serban@univ-montp3.fr
Polio Valéry universiteto Montpellier III docentė, dr., Prancūzija
Docent Uniwersytetu Paul Valéry, Montpellier III, dr, Francja
Senior lecturer, Paul Valéry University, Montpellier III, France

Yuri STULOV
yustulov@mail.ru
Minsko valstybinio lingvistikos universiteto profesorius, dr., Baltarusija
Profesor Państwowego Uniwersytetu Lingwistycznego w Mińsku, dr, Białoruś
Professor, Minsk State Linguistic University, Belarus

Leona TOKER
toker@mscc.huji.ac.il
Jeruzalės Hebrajų universiteto profesorė, habil. dr., Izraelis
Profesor Uniwersytetu Hebrajskiego w Jerozolimie, dr hab., Izrael
Professor, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Izrael

TURINYS / SPIS TREŚCI

I. DISKURSO IR NARATYVO TYRIMAI / BADANIA NAD DYSKURSEM I NARRACJĄ

Marek Ruszkowski (Lenkija / Polska). Fundamentalizm językowy 9

Ina Pukelytė (Lietuva / Litwa). Tarp dramos ir postdramos 18

Eglė Gabrėnaitė (Lietuva / Litwa). Politinio komentaro retorika: žanro transformacijos 25

Sylwia Konarska-Zimnicka (Lenkija / Polska). Socjologia a warsztat naukowy historyka. Przykład etnometodologii 33

Iwona Filipczak (Lenkija / Polska). Marginalization of South Asians Based on Race and Skin Color in Bharati Mukherjee's *Jasmine* and Chitra B. Divakaruni's *The Mistress of Spices* 46

Skirmantė Biržietienė (Lietuva / Litwa). Antikinė „lengvoji poezija": epigramos ypatumai 57

Ewa Anna Piasta (Lenkija / Polska). Motywy religijne w powieści *Gody magdeburskie* Gertrudy von Le Fort 65

II. KALBA. VISUOMENĖ. KULTŪRA / JĘZYK. SPOŁECZEŃSTWO. KULTURA

Oleksandr Kapranov (Norvegija / Norwegia). Conceptual Metaphors in British Foreign Secretary's Twitter Discourse Involving Ukraine 75

Татьяна Бобкова (Ukraina / Ukraina). Классификация коллокаций: основные подходы и критерии 87

Martyna Król (Lenkija / Polska). Homonimia wśród nominatów dotyczących czasu i przestrzeni: polsko-rosyjskie studium kontrastywne 99

Ольга Солодушко (Lenkija / Polska). Семантическая характеристика зоонимов, мотивированных пестрой окраской и узорами на шерсти животного (на примере кличек коров в польском и украинском языках) 107

Elżbieta Michow (Lenkija / Polska). Polskie i bułgarskie frazeologizmy somatyczne motywowane przez nazwy części ciała służących do mówienia 121

Olga V. Domnich (Ukraina / Ukraina). Etymologic Features and Peculiarities of the Process of Indigenous Vocabulary Borrowing in American English 130

Erika Merkytė-Švarcienė (Lietuva / Litwa). Tarmių mentalinio žemėlapio (ne)tikslumo veiksniai: tarmės vartojimas vs. nevartojimas 139

Ilona Mickienė, Rita Baranauskienė (Lietuva / Litwa). Veliuonos apylinkių pravardžių semantikos ypatumai: pirminės pravardės 155

Lina Bikelienė (Lietuva / Litwa). Evaluative Language in Lithuanian Students' English Writing. A Study of *Important* and *Interesting* 177

**III MOKSLINIO GYVENIMO KRONIKA /
KRONIKA ŻYCIA NAUKOWEGO**

Konferencijų apžvalgos / Konferencje

Gabija Bankauskaitė-Sereikienė (Lietuva / Litwa). Žanras: kanonas ar transformacija? 188

Jurgita Astrauskienė, Danguolė Satkauskaitė (Lietuva / Litwa). Tarp eilučių: kalbos ir medijų sankirta..... 191

Knygų recenzijos / Recenzje książek

Алла Диомидова (Lietuva / Litwa). Просто о сложном: новое пособие по фонетике русского языка..... 194

Aleksandras Krasnovas (Lietuva / Litwa). Apie lenkų tremtinius Sibire – išsamiai ir objektyviai..... 196

Anonsai / Zapowiedzi 199

**IV. REIKALAVIMAI STRAIPSNIAMS /
ZASADY OPRACOWYWANIA PUBLIKACJI**..... 200

CONTENTS

I. RESEARCH OF DISCOURSE AND NARRATIVE

Marek Ruszkowski (Poland). Linguistic Fundamentalism 9

Ina Pukelytė (Lithuania). Between Drama and Postdrama 18

Eglė Gabrėnaitė (Lithuania). The Rhetoric of Political Commentary: Genre Transformations 25

Sylwia Konarska-Zimnicka (Poland). Sociology and Methodology of Historical Research. Ethnomethodology 33

Iwona Filipczak (Poland). Marginalization of South Asians Based on Race and Skin Color in Bharati Mukherjee's *Jasmine* and Chitra B. Divakaruni's *The Mistress of Spices* 46

Skirmantė Biržietienė (Lithuania). Ancient "Simple Poetry": Peculiarities of the Epigram 57

Ewa Anna Piasta (Poland). Religious Motifs in the Novel *The Magdeburg Wedding* by Gertrud von le Fort 65

II. LANGUAGE. SOCIETY. CULTURE

Oleksandr Kapranov (Norway). Conceptual Metaphors in British Foreign Secretary's Twitter Discourse Involving Ukraine 75

Татьяна Бобкова (Ukraine). Classification of Collocation: The Main Approaches and Criteria 87

Martyna Król (Poland). Homonymy among the Nominates Concerning Time and Space: Polish-Russian Contrastive Study 99

Ольга Солодушко (Poland). Semantyc Analysis of Zoonyms Motivated by the Coloured Coat (Based on the Cow Names in Polish and Ukrainian) 107

Elżbieta Michow (Poland). Polish and Bulgarian Somatic Phrases Justified with the Names of the Parts of the Body Designed for Speaking 121

Olga V. Domnich (Ukraine). Etymologic Features and Peculiarities of the Process of Indigenous Vocabulary Borrowing in American English 130

Erika Merkytė-Švarcienė (Lithuania). Un(accuracy) Factors of the Mental Map of Dialects: Using vs. Non-using a Dialect 139

Ilona Mickienė, Rita Baranauskienė (Lithuania). Peculiarities of Nickname Semantics in Veliuona Region: Primary Nicknames 155

Lina Bikelienė (Lithuania). Evaluative Language in Lithuanian Students' English Writing. A Study of *Important* and *Interesting* 177

III. SCIENTIFIC LIFE CHRONICLE

Conference review

Gabija Bankauskaitė-Sereikienė (Lithuania). Genre: Canon or Transformation? 188

Jurgita Astrauskienė, Danguolė Satkauskaitė (Lithuania). Between the Lines: The Intersection of Speech and Media 191

Book reviews

Алла Диомидова (Lithuania). In Simple Words about Complicated: The New Guide to the Russian Phonetics.....194

Aleksandras Krasnovas (Lithuania). The Polish Exiles in Siberia: In Detail and Objectively.....196

Announcements 199

IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLICATION 200

II. KALBA. VISUOMENĖ. KULTŪRA / JĘZYK. SPOŁECZEŃSTWO. KULTURA

Oleksandr Kapranov
University of Bergen
PO Box 7805, 5020 Bergen, Norway
E-mail: Oleksandr.Kapranov@uib.no
Research interests: cognitive linguistics, discourse, psycholinguistics

CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS IN BRITISH FOREIGN SECRETARY'S TWITTER DISCOURSE INVOLVING UKRAINE

This article presents a qualitative study of conceptual metaphors identified in Twitter discourse involving Ukraine by the current British Foreign Secretary Phillip Hammond. The study further described in this article involves a corpus of Hammond's tweets associated with Ukraine, which is subsequently juxtaposed with Hammond's online articles and speeches involving Ukraine in order to elucidate whether or not there are Twitter-specific conceptual metaphors in Hammond's Twitter discourse associated with Ukraine. The results of the data analysis reveal that Hammond's short messages on Twitter, or tweets, associated with Ukraine are embedded in conceptual metaphors 'Ukraine's future EU Membership as a Journey', 'UK as a Nurturant Parent', 'EU as a Nurturant Parent', 'Country as a Friend Helping Ukraine' and 'Russia as the EU's OTHER'. Identical conceptual metaphors have been found in Hammond's online non-Twitter discourse involving Ukraine. These findings are further presented and discussed in the article.

KEY WORDS: conceptual metaphor, political discourse, Twitter, the UK, Ukraine.

1. British Foreign Secretary's Twitter Discourse Involving Ukraine

This article presents a qualitative study of conceptual metaphors identified in Twitter discourse involving Ukraine by the current British Foreign Secretary Phillip Hammond. Political discourse on Twitter is a relatively new area of discourse studies with multiple issues to be elucidated (Spina, Cancila 2013). One of these issues involves political discourse of foreign affairs regarded within the framework of cognitive linguistics. In the cognitive paradigm of linguistics, conceptual metaphors are considered a potent means of gaining insights into the political discourse (Musolff 2004). The qualitative study further presented in this article seeks to identify the conceptual metaphors associated with Ukraine in Twitter discourse by the UK's Foreign Secretary. Specifically, the study aims at i) identifying the conceptual metaphors associated with Ukraine in the Foreign Secretary's Twitter discourse and ii) juxtaposing these conceptual metaphors with the to-be-identified conceptual metaphors involving Ukraine in the Foreign Secretary's online non-Twitter discourse in order to establish whether or not there are Twitter-specific conceptual metaphors.

The novelty of this research rests with the cognitive linguistic analysis of conceptual metaphors associated with Ukraine within Twitter's constrained discursive space limited to no more than 140 characters per message or a 'tweet' (Spina, Cancila 2013: 147). As indicated by Anders Larsson and Hallvard Moe (2011: 743), the academic research involving Twitter-mediated political discourse is at its early stage and is predominantly cantered around the US political context. A novel aspect of this research paper is the focus on the UK's foreign political discourse on Twitter, in particular how the UK's Foreign Secretary frames his discourse about Ukraine via conceptual metaphors. In order to reiterate, it remains to be elucidated whether Hammond's political discourse involving Ukraine would exhibit the presence of conceptual metaphors specific to Twitter. Further, this article is structured as follows: first, political discourse on Twitter will be presented. Second, a brief outline of the UK's political discourse involving Ukraine will be provided. Third, conceptual metaphors associated with the European non-EU countries, such as Ukraine, will be discussed. Fourth, the conceptual metaphors associated with Ukraine in Hammond's Twitter discourse will be elucidated.

1.1. Political Discourse on Twitter

Twitter is designed to allow posting of 140-character texts or tweets to the network of Twitter followers (Marwick, Boyd 2010: 116). In contrast to Facebook, Twitter does not require its users to follow each other mutually in order to access the tweet (Larsson, Moe 2011). However, Twitter has a by-default function of displaying the number of followers on each user's page. This function allows gauging the audience and popularity of a Twitter account. Whilst Twitter is considered a non-political information-sharing site (Munson, Resnick 2011; Page 2012), it is widely used as a platform for updating the online community of Twitter followers on a range of current world affairs and political events (Xifra, Grau 2010) as well as socially relevant topics (Yardi, Boyd 2010). Previous research literature indicates that Twitter has become a legitimate and frequently used channel of political discourse (Tumasjan *et al.* 2010: 1). Politicians, public figures and celebrities have their own Twitter accounts where they post their tweets (Fischer, Reuber 2011; Marwick, Boyd 2010). Twitter is used in political discourse for the dissemination of political views and opinions as well as creating and maintaining online presence (Spina, Cancila 2013), reporting political events and construing political identities or political networked identities (Zappavigna 2013: 2).

The usage of Twitter in diplomatic discourse is often referred in the previous studies as 'Twiplomacy', i.e., 'Twitter' and 'diplomacy', or diplomacy via Twitter (Ponomarenko 2013). One of the distinctive characteristics of Twiplomacy involves the facilitation of diplomatic e-government affairs, public relations and communication with the foreign institutions (Su, Xu 2015: 19). Previous research studies indicate that Twiplomacy may involve government bodies, e.g., embassies, ministries of foreign affairs, intergovernmental organisations, etc., as well as individual diplomats, for instance, ambassadors and high commissioners (Ponomarenko 2013; Su, Xu 2015). The Foreign Office in the UK has a Twitter account authored by the British Foreign Secretary Sir Phillip Hammond. His Twitter

account is updated in conjunction with the current political situation, visits abroad, relations with the EU countries and non-EU countries in geographical Europe, such as Ukraine.

Twitter, as one of the social networks, can be conceptualised as a public online sphere. Eric Baumer and colleagues (2010: 1437) indicate that political micro-blogging on Twitter has become an increasingly influential and democratising source of news and information. Government officials who have their own Twitter accounts have identical posting rights to the non-political Twitter users. Notably, the politicians on Twitter have to abide to the ethical guidelines, which are identical to all the other Twitter users. Twitter induces an egalitarian type of online discourse, which is democratic, user-friendly and multimodal (Gillen, Merchant 2013; Zappavigna 2013). Twitter discourse has other unique characteristics, such as linking messages to users, hyperlinking to external internet sources and hashtagging (#) topics (Ausserhofer, Maireder 2013: 292). The public and egalitarian style of Twitter discourse involves the fluidity of meaning, innovation and creativity (Gillen, Merchand 2013: 49) concurrently with consciously managed, fixed and carefully controlled user's self-representations to the outside word (Marwick, Boyd 2010: 115). Consequently, Twitter offers a discursive space, which is constrained, creative and simultaneously controlled in terms of the input. Additionally, Twitter discourse is exceedingly dynamic due to "the speed with which topics ebb and flow on Twitter" (Yardi, Boyd 2010: 317). Presumably, such a discursive space would involve Twitter-specific modes of political discourse, in particular, foreign political discourse.

1.2. UK's Foreign Policy Involving Ukraine: A Brief Outline

The UK's foreign policy involving Ukraine has been marked by several phases since Ukraine's independence in 1991. The initial phase ranges from the long-term British neutrality towards Ukraine (Yakovenko 2003: 478) to neglecting, annoyance and insufficient interest in the country on the part of the West in general and the UK in particular (Alexandrova 1996: 147). A significant change in the UK's politics involving Ukraine takes place in the mid-1990s. Olga Alexandrova (1996: 149) indicates that starting from 1995, the UK's diplomacy recognises the importance of Ukraine as a 'strategic pivot' in the post-Cold War security architecture in Europe. Acting within the parameters of European security, the UK signs the Budapest Memorandum which guarantees Ukraine's territorial sovereignty in exchange for the country's non-nuclear status. In 2014-2015, Ukraine's related European security issues have been amongst the foci of British diplomacy in the context of the Crimea annexation and the proxy war in Eastern Ukraine (Hughes 2014). In this regard, the British diplomacy views itself as having a substantial 'soft power' to facilitate the peaceful solution of war in the Eastern Ukraine, since "Britain remains one of the few countries in the world that can set the global foreign policy agenda, its multilateral ties helping it deal, for example, with thorny dilemmas such as Russian revanchism in the Ukraine" (Daddow 2015: 306).

Another substantial sign of the UK's involvement in Ukraine's geopolitics is evident from the UK's support to the Eastern Partnership Agreement, which Ukraine is a part of, as well as the UK's endorsement of the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement. The UK

endorses a potential EU membership of Ukraine and other European non-EU countries, e.g., Macedonia, Serbian, Turkey, etc. (Aydin-Düzgit 2013; White *et al.* 2010). For instance, the opinion poll conducted in June 2015 indicates that 51% of the British respondents are not against the possible Ukraine's accession to the EU (Panchenko 2015). However, the British positive attitude towards Ukraine's potential membership in the EU is concurrent with PM Cameron's Conservative Coalition Government framing of the EU affairs from the vantage point of the pending referendum in the UK involving Britain's EU membership. Arguably, British Euroscepticism coupled with the UK's benevolent stance towards Ukraine construe a diverse and polyphonic discursive space.

1.3. Conceptual Metaphors in Political Discourse Referring to European Non-EU States

Political discourse is a specific genre of discourse which encompasses policy construction by societal and political actors on the levels ranging from an individual person, a local community to the whole state (Schmidt, Radaelli 2004). Following this line of reasoning, discourse is seen as arising from the interaction of multiple complex dynamic contexts and operating on multiple time scales and levels (Cameron, Deignan 2006: 674). The socio-cognitive turn in linguistic paradigm regards political discourse as a social space mediated by cognition (Wodak 2002: 8). This mediation often involves the mechanism of conceptual metaphor (Musolff 2004).

In contrast with the traditional rhetorical paradigm, conceptual metaphors are viewed as a fundamental aspect of human cognition (Gibbs 2014). Conceptual metaphors are deemed to be present in many non-linguistic domains of everyday cognition (Gibbs 2014: 25). Conceptual metaphors involve mappings of knowledge structures form the concrete and physical source domain into a more abstract target domain (Semino 2008). In order to specify, the conceptual metaphors constitute "a mechanism of categorisation that 'maps' matching aspects of a source domain concept onto a target domain concept, often giving a more concrete, vivid image of an abstract notion" (Musolff 2000: 218).

Conceptual metaphors provide cognitive frames for the perspective on social and political issues (Charteris-Black 2006: 565). Conceptual metaphors are an important means of studying political discourse (Musolff 2004), since they construe and constrain the framing of a political narrative, especially in the political discourse of international relations, the EU enlargement, European integration and the EU external affairs, etc. Previous research involving British foreign political discourse on European non-EU countries indicates that this discursive space is conceived as an identity narrative space framed by metaphorisation (Hüssle 2006: 397).

The discursive space of British foreign politics involving European non-EU states, such as, for instance, Moldova, Ukraine and other Eastern Partnership countries, is framed by a number conceptual metaphors, which manifest ideological, cultural and ethnic attitudes and stereotypes (Szewel 2002: 94). Current literature on discourse studies has identified these metaphors as 'EU Enlargement as a Family Reunion', 'EU Enlargement as a Homecoming', 'EU Accession as a Path', 'EU as a Nurturant Parent', etc. (Musolff

2004). For instance, 'EU Enlargement as a Family Reunion' (Hüssle 2006: 406) involves a non-EU country which joins the EU and is conceptualised as a family member who has reunited with the rest of the family, i.e., the EU. In other words, the states which share the identical SELF are equated with the family members. Similarly, the EU enlargement is framed via conceptual metaphor 'EU Enlargement as a Homecoming' (Hüssle 2006). A non-EU country joining the EU metaphorically 'comes home', i.e., merges with SELF (the EU) as an intrinsic part of SELF. It follows that the EU is construed as a house, and when a European non-EU country enters this house, it is a homecoming act. The entry into the symbolic EU house entails long waiting times and a metaphorical path that covers everything from the start of the accession negotiations to the result, the EU house entry (Musolff 2004). The framing of the EU entry as a path gives rise to the conceptual metaphor 'EU Accession as a Path', which is applicable to the UK's foreign political discourse involving Ukraine.

2. Hypothesis

Previous studies indicate that Twitter discourse possesses unique characteristics (Ausserhofer, Maireder 2013), such as consciously managed, fixed and carefully controlled user's self-representations in the constrained discursive space (Marwick, Boyd 2010: 115). Based on this contention, it is assumed in the present hypothesis that Foreign Secretary Hammond's Twitter discourse involving Ukraine would exhibit the properties of a discursive space, which is identical to the online non-Twitter discourse involving Ukraine. Hence, the specific research aim of the study involves the juxtaposition of conceptual metaphors associated with Ukraine in Hammond' Twitter discourse with conceptual metaphors involving Ukraine in Hammond's online non-Twitter discourse in order to establish whether or not they are identical.

3. Materials and Methods

In order to verify the hypothesis, a corpus of tweets involving Ukraine on Hammond's official Twitter account at www.twitter.com is compiled and analysed. In the corpus, Hammond's tweets are examined from 22.09.2014 (the day the account was opened) to 01.02.2016. Following previous research (Fischer, Reuber 2011; Xifra, Grau 2010), the Twitter corpus is considered as a genre of political microblogging via social media. All Hammond's Twitter entries, referred to as 'tweets', are deemed to be authored by Hammond personally, since they involve direct references to the first person singular (*I, me*, etc.). Then, a corpus of Hammond's online non-Twitter discourse involving Ukraine is compiled and analysed at www.gov.uk by using key-words 'Ukraine', 'EU', 'Eastern Partnership', 'accession' and 'EU enlargement'. The corpus of online non-Twitter speeches comprise 20 online speeches and direct quotes by Hammond (all of the speeches and quotes are available at www.gov.uk). The online non-Twitter corpus is deemed to adhere to the genre of political discourse. The corpus has been checked for completeness by the UK's Foreign Office Information Desk.

The analysis of Hammond's tweets involves an electronic search for hashtags (#) containing key-words 'Ukraine', 'EU', 'Eastern Partnership', 'accession' and 'EU enlargement'. It total, 33 tweets on Twitter and 20 online speeches available at www.gov.uk have been identified. Multiple entries written on the same date are counted as separate tweets. Then, the corpus is analysed qualitatively according to the research methodology described in Andreas Musolff (2004). The analysis of cognitive metaphor followed Musolff (2004), where a metaphor is identified based on the cross-domain mappings between the unrelated domains of experience.

4. Results and Discussion

Qualitative investigation has revealed the presence of identical conceptual metaphors associated with Ukraine in both the Twitter corpus and in the online non-Twitter corpus. Hence, it can be assumed that the hypothesis is supported. With 33 tweets in total, conceptual metaphors are present in 28 tweets; whilst five tweets exhibit the presence of conceptual metonymy (metonymy is beyond the scope of the present article). Data analysis reveals that the Foreign Secretary's Twitter discourse involving Ukraine is framed by conceptual metaphors 'Ukraine's future EU Membership as a Journey', 'UK as a Nurturant Parent', 'EU as a Nurturant Parent', 'Country as a Friend Helping Ukraine' and 'Russia as the EU's OTHER'. These findings are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1. **Conceptual metaphors associated with Ukraine in Hammond's Twitter discourse**

Total N in tweets	Conceptual Metaphor	Examples
5	The UK as a Nurturant Parent	Positive talks with President @Poroshenko re situation on ground, #Minsk agreement & reform. **Reaffirmed strong UK support** for #Ukraine (05.03.2015).
8	Country as a Friend Helping Ukraine	Constructive talk with **Czech FM** @ZaoralekL on Western Balkans, #EUreform to create jobs & growth & **unity on Ukraine** (27.02.2015).
11	Russia as the EU's OTHER	In Tallinn to see @KeitPentus. Discussed importance of reform in Europe & agreed **we must stand firm against Russia** (23.02.2015).
1	EU as a Nurturant Parent	Discussed #Russia with @FredericaMog: **EU must stand firm with #Ukraine.** Map of Europe cannot be redrawn by force (24.02.2015).
3	Ukraine's future EU membership as a Journey	Good to meet #Ukraine parliamentary Speaker Groysman to **discuss vital reform, anti-corruption & decentralization plans** (05.03.2015).

The analysis of conceptual metaphors in Hammond's online non-Twitter speeches (total N = 20) involving Ukraine has yielded the results presented in Table 2. It should be noted that several conceptual metaphors have been identified per article; hence, the total number of conceptual metaphors exceeds the total number of online non-Twitter speeches.

Table 2. **Conceptual metaphors associated with Ukraine in Hammond's online non-Twitter discourse**

Total N in tweets	Conceptual Metaphor	Examples
4	The UK as a Nurturant Parent	**The UK stands squarely behind the Ukrainian people and government** as they defend their nation's independence and work towards the political, economic and governance reforms that are vital to rebuilding the country (14.12.2014).
7	Country as a Friend Helping Ukraine	**Poland and United Kingdom stand side by side**… We have worked together within the EU supporting sanctions against Russia; and **with Sweden we championed enhanced assistance to Ukraine** (29.07.2014).
20	Russia as the EU's OTHER	The recent escalation in fighting would not be possible without the military support and strategic direction that Russia provides. In these circumstances it is vital that all those **countries who have a stake in the rules-based international system** remain clear and **united against Russian aggression** (10.02.2015).
1	EU as a Nurturant Parent	The **EU should continue to support the reforms** in the countries of the Eastern Partnership and the implementation of the Association Agreement & Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas with **Ukraine**, Moldova and Georgia (14.01.2015).
2	Ukraine's future EU membership as a Journey	We reiterate **our strong support for EU enlargement on the basis of firm and fair conditionality**. We encourage the countries of the region to carry out the necessary **reforms that will ensure functioning state institutions, democracy, rule of law and respect for human tights, including minorities** (14.01.2015).

Judging from the data, it can be assumed that the Foreign Secretary's Twitter discourse involving Ukraine is not characterised by Twitter-specific conceptual metaphors associated with Ukraine. Hammond frames his narrative involving Ukraine by the means of identical conceptual metaphors used irrespectively of the medium of communication. Specifically, both on Twitter and in online non-Twitter discourse, Hammond construes Ukraine via conceptual metaphors 'UK as a Nurturant Parent', 'EU as a Nurturant Parent', 'Country as a Friend Helping Ukraine', 'Ukraine's future EU Membership as a Journey' and 'Russia as the EU's OTHER'.

Interestingly, the conceptual metaphors 'UK as a Nurturant Parent', 'EU as a Nurturant Parent', 'Country as a Friend Helping Ukraine' involve a mapping from the concrete and physical domain COUNTRY (e.g., the UK, Ukraine, the EU as a country block) into several unrelated and more abstract domains, such as a PARENT and a FRIEND. The abstractedness of the latter domains rests with their generic, unspecified features, such as non-marked gender, age, marital status, children, etc. Specifically, the data analysis indicates that the cross-domain mapping from COUNTRY into PARENT instantiates conceptual metaphors 'UK as a Nurturant Parent' and 'EU as a Nurturant Parent'. The narrative of the UK as a metaphoric parent alongside with the EU takes a variety of forms. The UK, as a concerned and nurturing parent, provides care, medical treatment and

non-lethal aid and as well lends strong moral support to Ukraine, which, consequently, is conceptualised as a metaphoric child, a receiver of the paternal help, as evident from the tweet dating to 14.12.2014:

(1) *UK to provide medical treatment in Birmingham for 5 wounded Ukrainian servicemen.*

On the same date, 14.12.2014, in an online non-Twitter speech, Hammond frames Ukraine-related discourse via the identical conceptual metaphor 'UK as a Nurturant Parent', for example:

(2) *The UK stands squarely behind the Ukrainian people and government as they defend their nation's independence and work towards the political, economic and governance reforms that are vital to rebuilding the country*.

In the second example (2), the UK as a PARENT morally supports Ukraine and '*stands squarely behind Ukrainian people*', whist the UK's parental support is more tangible in the first example (1) that is related to the medical care of the wounded Ukrainian soldiers. Notably, Hammond conceptualises the EU as a metaphoric collective PARENT who cares and supports Ukraine. In particular, referring to Ukraine's crisis, Hammond construes both the UK and the EU as nurturing and caring PARENTS with a common EU policy of defending their economic, geostrategic and political interests and values in Ukraine, as seen in the example provided in Table 1: "EU must stand firm with #Ukraine. Map of Europe cannot be redrawn by force" (24.02.2015). This finding is in concert with the previous research which emphasises the role of the FAMILY metaphor in the EU discourse, especially in relation to the Eastern European states, which "are deemed to have become the responsibility of the Western grown-up states – it is left open whether the latter are conceptualized as parents or older siblings" (Musolff 2006: 30). Given that Ukraine is regarded by Hammond as a metaphorical child, a receiver of the parental protection and support, it can be generalised that Hammond implicitly embeds the construal of his Ukraine-related discourse into the PARENT-CHILD schema, which is linked to the FAMILY metaphor.

As there are relationships of friendship within and outside the FAMILY, the FRIEND metaphor in Hammond's Ukraine-related discourse is instantiated via 'Country as a Friend Helping Ukraine'. Following Petr Drulak (2004), in international political discourse, independent states can be conceptualised as such metaphors: 'States as Enemies', 'States as Rivals' and 'States as Friends'. Hammond frames the EU and NATO countries as metaphorical friends who aid Ukraine, thus giving rise to the conceptual metaphor 'Country as a Friend Helping Ukraine'. This metaphor is facilitated by the reference to the UK's allies both inside and outside of the EU, as evident from the third tweet (3) and an online non-Twitter quote in example four (4):

(3) *Press conference with @JohnKerry on #ISIL #Ebola + #Ukraine. US is UK's greatest foreign policy ally* (08.10.2014);

(4) *The US and UK have met with Germany to discuss the latest situation in Ukraine and the recent talks held in Moscow. It is clear that the escalation in fighting in the east of Ukraine cannot be allowed to continue and a political solution is imperative* (07.02.2015).

The FRIEND metaphor in Hammond's discourse that is associated with Ukraine seems to be embedded into the UK-USA Transatlantic partnership, which is manifested by the framing of the US as the UK's '*greatest foreign policy ally'*. This framing is further reinforced by grouping the UK and the US into a single entity in example four (4): '*The US and UK have met with Germany'*. Another facet of the FRIEND metaphor involves the EU countries which border with Ukraine and with whom the UK has strong ties, for example:

(5) *Delighted to meet PM Fico and @MiroslavLajcak to talk about #Ukraine, EU reform and strength of UK/Slovakia relations* (30.10.2014).

Arguably, the PARENT/FAMILY and FRIEND metaphors in Hammond's discourse associated with Ukraine pertain to the conceptual domain of SELF, regarded as the transatlantic space involving the USA, the EU and Ukraine. The parental West and the UK assist Ukraine on its path towards SELF, which is seen as a metaphorical JOURNEY with its constitutive elements SOURCE (Ukraine as not a part of SELF) – PATH (actions planned or taking place to become SELF) – AIM (Ukraine's future EU accession). The JOURNEY metaphor in the present corpus is instantiated by 'Ukraine's future EU membership as a Journey'. This conceptual metaphor is evident in example six (6), where Hammond emphasises that Ukraine's path towards SELF (i.e. the EU and the West in general) involves concrete reforms, which require time and effort in order to get the country closer to the EU:

(6) *Good to discuss #Ukraine reform & anti/corruption w PM @Yatsenyuk Ap. Progress made in difficult circ, more to do* (05.03.2015).

As seen from Table 2, the UK facilitates Ukraine's journey towards the EU membership: "We reiterate our strong support for EU enlargement on the basis of firm and fair conditionality" (14.01.2015). However, Ukraine's future EU membership is not automatic, it is a process metaphorically regarded as a journey with such accoutrements as the necessary reforms, functioning state institutions, democracy and the rule of law to bring Ukraine inside of SELF, i.e., into the EU.

However, the very existence of SELF presupposes an antagonistic OTHER. The OTHER-ness in Hammond's Ukraine-related discourse is manifested by conceptual metaphor 'Russia as the EU's OTHER'. This metaphor has been identified in multiple tweets and online non-Twitter articles, where Hammond emphasises that the EU, the UK and the West oppose Russia in its aggression in the East of Ukraine and in the Crimea peninsula, for instance, in the speech available at www.gov.uk, the Foreign Secretary indicates that:

(7) *It is completely unacceptable for Russia to use force to change borders. We do not recognise last year's sham referendum which President Putin has admitted was planned to provide a fig leaf for his land grab. This behaviour threatens international security, and has grave implications for the legal order that protects the integrity and sovereignty of all states* (22.03.2015).

The data indicate that OTHER-ing Russia foregrounds the idea of the EU's consolidated stance against Russian aggression in Ukraine, for example:

(8) *In Tallinn to see @KeitPentus. Discussed importance of reform in Europe & agreed we must stand firm against Russia* (23.02.2015).

It should be noted that OTHER-ing Russia in the context of the UK's politics involving Ukraine is a recurrent theme in Hammond discourse. The OTHER-ing appears to be embedded in an opposition of EU/WEST together with Ukraine versus Russia, e.g., '*we must stand firm against Russia'* (6).

Conclusions

This article examines a corpus of tweets on Twitter by the UK's Foreign Secretary Phillip Hammond (July 2014 – present) involving Ukraine. Qualitative analysis indicates that both the Twitter and online non-Twitter corpora are characterised by such conceptual metaphors as 'Ukraine's future EU Membership as a Journey', 'UK as a Nurturant Parent', 'EU as a Nurturant Parent', 'Country as a Friend Helping Ukraine' and 'Russia as the EU's OTHER'. It can be generalised that Hammond's political discourse involving Ukraine is structured by the means of conceptual metaphors irrespective of the medium of communication. The corpus of Hammond's tweets involving Ukraine does not contain Twitter-specific conceptual metaphors associated with Ukraine. Arguably, in political official discourse, it is represented by high-ranking officials, such as the UK Foreign Secretary, linguistic innovation and creativity are overridden by the constraints of the official communication. Hence, Ukraine is framed in Hammond's tweets by the means of conceptual metaphors which do not differ qualitatively from those identified in Hammond's online non-Twitter discourse involving Ukraine.

Acknowledgments

The author of this article would like to acknowledge a post-doctoral research grant from the University of Bergen and the Norwegian Research Council which enabled to write this article. The author of this article is as well eager to express appreciation for the British Foreign Office Information Desk's assistance with the materials used in the present study.

Sources

UK Government. Available from: www.gov.uk [Accessed 30 November 2015].

Twitter. Available from: www.twitter.com [Accessed 30 November 2015].

References

ALEXANDROVA, O., 1996. Ukraine and Western Europe. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 20, 145–170.

AUSSERHOFER, J., MAIREDER, A., 2013. National Politics on Twitter. *Information, Communication and Society*, 16 (3), 291–314.

AYDIN-DÜZGIT, S., 2013. Critical Discourse Analysis in Analysing EU Foreign Policy: Prospects and Challenges. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 49 (3), 1–21.

BAUMER, E., SINCLAIR, J., IRVINE, B., 2010. 'America Is Like Metamucil': Fostering Critical and Creative Thinking about Metaphor in Political Blogs. *CHI 2010: Expressing and Understanding Opinions in Social Media*, 1437–1446.

CAMERON, L., DEGNAN, A., 2006. The Emergence of Metaphor in Discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, 27 (4), 671–690.

CHARTERIS-BLACK, J., 2006. Britain as a Container: Immigration Metaphors in the 2005 Election Campaign. *Discourse and Society*, 17 (5), 563–581.

DADDOW, O., 2015. Constructing a 'Great' Role for Britain in an Age of Austerity: Interpreting Coalition Foreign Policy. *International Relations*, 29 (3), 303–318.

DRULAK, P., 2004. Metaphors Europe Lives by: Language and Institutional Change of the European Union. *EUI Working Paper SPS*, 15, 1–53.

FISCHER, E., REUBER, R. A., 2011. Social Interaction via New Social Media: (How) Can Interactions on Twitter Affect Effectual Thinking and Behavior? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26, 1–18.

GIBBS, R. W., 2014. Conceptual Metaphor in Thought and Social Action. *In:* Eds. M. J. Landau, M. D. Robinson, B. P. Meier. *The Power of Metaphor: Examining Its Influence on Social Life*. Washington: American Psychological Association, 17–40.

GILLEN, J., MERCHANT, G., 2013. Contact Calls: Twitter as a Dialogic Social and Linguistic Practice. *Language Science*, 35, 47–58.

HUGHES, G., 2014. Ukraine: Europe's New Proxy War? *Fletcher Security Review*, 1 (2), 106–118.

HÜSSLE, R., 2006. Imagine the EU: The Metaphorical Construction of a Supra-Nationalist Identity. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 9, 396–421.

LARSSON, A., MOE, H., 2011. Studying Political Microblogging: Twitter Users in the 2010 Swedish Election Campaign. *New Media and Society*, 14 (5), 729–747.

MARVICK, A., BOYD, D., 2010. I Tweet Honestly, I Tweet Passionately: Twitter Users, Context Collapse, and the Imagined Audience. *New Media and Society*, 13 (1), 114–133.

MUNSON, S., RESNIK, P., 2011. The Prevalence of Political Discourse in Non-Political Blogs. Available from: www.aaai.org [Accessed 15 January 2016].

MUSOLFF, A., 2000. Political Imagery of Europe: A House Without Exit Doors? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 21 (3), 216–229.

MUSOLFF, A., 2004. *Metaphor and Political Discourse: Analogical Reasoning in Debates across Europe.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

MUSOLFF, A., 2006. Metaphor Scenarios in Public Discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 21 (1), 23–38.

PAGE, R., 2012. The Linguistics of Self-Branding and Micro-Celebrity in Twitter: The Role of Hashtags. *Discourse and Communication*, 6 (2), 181–210.

PANCHENKO, Y., 2015. *Ukraine through the Eyes of the Europeans: Stereotypes and Unexpected Assessments*. Available from: www.eurointegration.com.ua/articles/2015/06/24/7035179/ [Accessed 05 November 2015].

PONOMARENKO, O., 2013. Dyplomatija, tryplomatija, tviplomatija: novitnij kanon dyplomatychnogo dyskursu. *Visnyk Kyivskogo Nacionalnogo Universytetu im. Tarasa Shevchenka*, 30–33.

SCHMIDT, V., RADAELLI, C., 2004. Policy Change and Discourse in Europe: Conceptual and Methodological Issues. *West European Politics*, 27 (2), 183–210.

SEMINO, E., 2008. *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SPINA, S., CANCILA, J., 2013. Gender Issues in the Interactions of Italian Politicians on Twitter: Identity, Representation and Flows of Conversation. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Studies and Environmental Communication*, 2 (2), 147–157.

SU, S., XU, M., 2015. Twiplomacy: Social Media as a New Platform for Development of Public Diplomacy. *International Journal of E-Politics*, 6 (1), 16–29.

SZEWEL, A., 2002. Anthropocentric Metaphor in Political Discourse: A Fragment of Conceptual Analysis. *Studia Anglica Resoviensia*, 6, 92–98.

TUMASJAN, A., SPRENGER, T., SANDNER, P., WELPE, I., 2010. Election Forecast With Twitter: How 140 Characters Reflect the Political Landscape. *Social Science Computer Review*, 1–17.

WHITE, S., MCALLISTER, I., FEKLYUNINA, V., 2010. Belarus, Ukraine and Russia: East or West? *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 12, 344–367.

WODAK, R., 2002. What CDA is About. A Summary of its History, Important Concepts and Developments. *In:* Eds. R. WODAK, M. MEYER. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis: Introducing Qualitative Methods*. Thousand Oaks/New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1–14.

XIFRA, J., GRAU, F., 2010. Nanoblogging PR: The Discourse on Public Relations in Twitter. *Public Relations Review*, 36, 171–174.

YAKOVENKO, N., 2003. Ukraine in British Strategies and Concepts of Foreign Policy, 1917–1922 and After. *East European Quarterly*, 36 (4), 465–479.

YARDI, S., BOYD, D., 2010. Dynamic Debates: An Analysis of Group Polarization Over Time on Twitter. *Bulletin of Science. Technology and Society*, 30 (5), 316–327.

ZAPPAVIGNA, M., 2013. Enacting Identity in Microblogging through Ambient Affiliation. *Discourse and Communication*, 1–20.

Gauta 2015 06 22
Priimta publikuoti 2016 01 10