


**E. G. Malysheva**

Dostoyevsky Omsk State University, Omsk, Russia

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4513-5086 

**I. S. Pirozhkova (translation from Russian)**

Ural State Pedagogical University, Ekaterinburg, Russia

ORCID ID: —

 **E-mail:** *malysheva\_eg@mail.ru*.

## Ideologeme as Lingo-cognitive Phenomenon: Definition and Classification

**ABSTRACT.** *The article focuses on the issue of definition of the concept “ideologeme” which is extremely significant for modern linguistics, and specifically for political linguistics. This research determines what phenomena may be treated as ideologemes i.e. perform the function of ideology representation, become the “form of ideology” and “a sign of ideology”. We argue the possibility of interpretation of “ideologeme” as a special type of multi-layer concept, in the structure of which there are ideologically marked conceptual features that embody collective, often stereotypical and mythological image that exists in the minds of language speakers about the authorities, the state, the nation, society, and political and ideological institutions. Ideologeme is a mental cognitive element, a unit of ideological worldview that is used in a text (verbal or creolized), and even in discourse in the form of language units of different levels and signs of other semiotic systems. Furthermore, this article attempts to classify ideologemes on four grounds: the nature of conceptualized information; the sphere of usage and comprehension by native speakers; the pragmatic component; the topicality/outdatedness of ideologeme in contemporary ideological worldview. This classification provides additional information about the types of ideologemes.*

**KEYWORDS:** *cognitive linguistics; ideologeme, concept; classification of ideologemes.*

**AUTHOR'S INFORMATION:** *Malysheva Elena Grigorievna, Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor, Head of Department of Journalism and Media Linguistics, Faculty of Philology and Media Communication, Dostoyevsky Omsk State University, Omsk, Russia, e-mail: malysheva\_eg@mail.ru.*

**TRANSLATOR'S INFORMATION:** *Pirozhkova Irina Sergeevna, Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor, Department of Intercultural Communication, Rhetoric and Russian as a Foreign Language, Institute of Philology, Culturology and Intercultural Communication, Ural State Pedagogical University, Ekaterinburg, Russia, e-mail: irene22@live.ru.*

**FOR CITATION:** *Malysheva, E. G. Ideologeme as Lingo-cognitive Phenomenon: Definition and Classification / E. G. Malysheva; transl.into Engl. by I. S. Pirozhkova // Political Linguistics. — 2019. — No 1 (73). — P. 134—144.*

### 1. Ideology and ideologeme: definition of concepts

The term “ideologeme” was introduced by M.M. Bakhtin to name the forms of ideology that exist in reality [Bakhtin 1975; 1994 and others]. Today it is used in many branches of science: philosophy and history, culture study and linguistics and many others.

In the variety of definitions of this phenomenon that exist due to the peculiarities of the object and scope of research in different branches of science, the common feature of these definitions is the characteristics outlined by M.M. Bakhtin: ideologeme is explication, a means of representation of this or that *ideology*. It is important to mention that M.M. Bakhtin treated both ideologeme and ideology in the broad and even semiotic sense; that is why many researchers find similarities between the views on society, human nature and language of M.M. Bakhtin and R. Barth [see Kosikov 2009].

Worthy of note is that in Bakhtin's concept worked out in the 1930-s (“Discourse in the Novel”, 1934-1935, “Forms of Time and of the

Chronotope in the Novel”, 1937-1938, “From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse”, 1940) “the term “ideology” is used both in its conventional meaning — ideology is “the leading idea, the axis or conception” [Spirkin 2009], and in the “acquired” meaning — ideology as “a unity of ideas, myths, beliefs, political slogans, public declarations of parties and philosophic conceptions” [New philosophic dictionary 2003]. This interpretation of ideology, “being non-religious in its essence ..., proceeds from the comprehended and “reconstructed” reality, is focused on people's interests and aims, and on manipulation and control of people by means of alteration of their consciousness” [New philosophic dictionary 2003].

Using the terms *ideology* and *ideologeme* to describe language stratification, M.M. Bakhtin builds his theory in the following paradigm: “the national language, being unified when viewed as an abstract phenomenon,” is divided into “verbal-ideological and social layers”, “into languages-ideologemes”, each of which has its own “socio-ideological environment”, “its slogan, its own abusive language and its own

compliments" [Bakhtin 1975: 101, 104], and none of the languages "can provide a holistic view of the world" [Kosikov 2009: 10].

It is important to mention that different ideologies are often biased and false; and thus R. Barth comes to the idea of joining ideology and myth. He names this phenomenon "meta language" or "secondary semiotic system" or "secondary language" without any semiotic differentiation of these concepts. Barth defines ideology as a mythological construction within the frames of general history that meets the interests of certain groups of people [Barth 1996].

R. Barth's view is quite peculiar (for instance he interprets a sign as a unity of the denoted and the denotator), however, the correlation between ideology and myth revealed in his works plays a great role in the modern interpretation of the essence of ideological mechanisms. Thus, "the status of ideology as embodiment of relations between discourse and social topic is described in contemporary philosophy in terms of credibility" [New philosophic dictionary 2003]. Mind that it is credibility, not identity.

Moreover, when describing ideology, N.I. Shestov defines it as "a political myth sanctioned by a political institution" [Shestov 2005: 95], which is constructed both non-verbally (demonstrations, state and military symbols, etc.) and verbally (for instance, euphemisms, labels, stereotypes, political terms, lexical repetitions, periphrases, parallel syntactical constructions, metaphors and others).

In general, the role of ideology in the 20th and 21st centuries is hard to overestimate: ideologization and politicization are typical of those spheres of human activity and human existence which should not be "involved" into ideology as they are marked as "being above ideology and politics". This happens to the sphere of world-class sport, which in 2016—2018 became a ground for violent information war against Russia and a means of temporary isolation of Russia as an independent country on the sports arena.

In our opinion, the events mentioned above prove once again the fact which is found in many cultural, historical, sociological and linguistic research works: even phenomena that have nothing to do with any spheres of politics, state, power or ideology may sometime come under the influence of ideology. In this connection, we find interesting the views on the transformations in the Soviet ideological worldview of cultural concepts into concepts-canons [Shkaiderova 2007: 19-28] and the idea of K.A. Alekseev that "the level of achievements in sport by a country often becomes a marker of stability of this country, and even resilience of the nation in general. It is applicable to almost any socio-

political system, dominant ideology and cultural paradigm" [Alekseev 2009].

However, in this part of the paper we are trying to answer the following question: phenomena of what level may be called ideologemes, i.e. which of them perform the function of ideology representation and appear as the "form of ideology" or ideological "sign"?

Going back to the statements given above, we may conclude that the "father" of the concept "ideologeme" is M.M. Bakhtin, philosopher and literary scholar. In his view, ideologemes are both sociolects taken as a whole and language and/or conceptual "markers" of such sociolects. However, it is obvious that he spoke about the worldview reflected in these "languages-ideologemes", which, in his opinion, was "heavily inadequate to reality", and contained only "a piece, one element of the world", "opinion", "ideologeme", some "hypotheses of meaning" [Bakhtin 1975: 105 and further]. The quotations contain theoretical provisions that determined the "flow of ideas" of contemporary linguists and culture experts who focus on totalitarian discourse and totalitarian language. Besides, the quotes show that the term ideologeme is multifold in the works of M.M. Bakhtin, which may be explained by the ambiguity but at the same time applicability of the phenomenon.

So, in contemporary linguoculturology and political linguistics (as well as in culturology, sociology and history), we are witnessing the growing interest to the phenomenon of ideologeme, which is due to the study and description of specific linguistic and conceptual features of the totalitarian period of the Soviet Union and the totalitarian language of the Soviet era [Kupina 1995, Torokhova 2006, Odessky, Feldman 2008, and others].

However, in all the studies mentioned above, the concept *ideologeme* is interpreted differently.

In this research we have singled out two approaches to the definition of ideologeme and interpretation of it *in terms of linguistics* — a broad definition and a narrow definition.

Thus, giving a definition of totalitarian language, E.A. Zemskaya underlines that it is ... a kind of a system of ideologemes, a means of reflection and formation of ideology-driven mind of a "Soviet man" [Zemskaya 1996: 23]. This is a *broad* linguoculturological approach to the concept of *ideologeme*.

A similar definition of the described phenomenon is given in the paper by T. Novikova [Novikova 2006] and in the monograph "D.S.P. Soviet ideologemes in Russian discourse of the 1990-s" by G.Ch. Guseynov [Guseynov 2004], which analyze "the forms of existence of

ideologemes” and the ways of representation of ideologeme in texts.

Such statements make it possible to suppose that an ideologeme is interpreted by the researcher as an element of non-verbal layer, a conceptual unit, which is embodied in the elements of a language; however, it is obvious that “the form of existence of an ideologeme” is *ideologemes of different types* which appear on different levels of the text — from *the minimal unit or a sign* (letter-ideologeme (in Russian these are the letters soft sign or yer (еръ), б (б), н (н), е (е); inflection-ideologeme, case inflection for instance (*izmena Rodiny* and *izmena Rodine*, *Federativnaya Respublika Germanii* and *Federativnaya Respublika Germaniya*)); to the *ideologeme—name* (toponym, ergonym, etc.); *ideologeme-quotation* (for example transformed statements of Stalin). Besides, from the point of view of G.Guseynov, ideologemes include obscene and swear words, which had ideological function in the Soviet period. *The Russian (Cyrillic) alphabet* is considered to be a *macroideologeme* of the USSR for the speakers of non-Slavic languages. The author singles out *ideologeme-accent* in mass media communication, cinema, theatre and everyday speech. On the basis of Stalinisms or Stalin’s prizes referred to in everyday speech, the linguist shows the development of ideological speech in general and explains the “vitality” of *ideologemes-Stalinisms* in the post-soviet discourse.

Thus, G.Ch. Guseynov, on the one hand, treats ideologeme as any language unit (including a text or a group of texts), which “marks” the Soviet ideology for native speakers; on the other hand, it is obvious that there are ideologemes of “the other level” — ideologemes as conceptual elements of ideology, which are represented in language with the help of the abovementioned units of different levels.

An even broader approach or culturological interpretation of an ideologeme is found in the monograph “Map of our Motherland: ideologeme between a word and body” by G. Guseynov [Guseynov 2005], which discusses “symbolic geography”: a map is viewed as an ideological element, a kind of ideologeme, which is proved, in the author’s view, by the attractiveness of the map of our country and its frequent use in advertising and political and TV discourses.

Speaking about the linguistic definition of the term *ideologeme* in its *narrow meaning*, it is important to refer to the views of N.A. Kupina, A.P. Chudinov, T.B. Radbil and other prominent linguists, who agree that an ideologeme is a verbal unit, a word which “is connected directly to an ideological denotatum” [Kupina 2005: 91] and “has an ideological component in its mean-

ing” [Chudinov 2007: 92]; “any verbal denomination of spiritual values meaningful for a person, when the direct meaning of a word is blurred and the emphasis is laid of pure evaluative, emotional and expressive connotations which are not based on the content of the word” [Radbil 1998: 22].

Going into detail, N.A. Kupina defines an ideologeme as “a belief (prescription) expressed in the form of a language” [Kupina 1995: 43], “language unit, whose semantics covers ideological denotatum or is superimposed on the semantics of non-ideological denotatum” [Kupina 2000: 183].

From this perspective, totalitarian language is a “hypertext of ideologemes”: “totalitarian language is systemic” and “it has its own vocabulary that can be presented as a number of clusters of ideologemes” which are “accompanied by precedent texts from the so-called original sources” [Kupina 1995: 138].

So, in contemporary linguistics, ideologeme is interpreted as a comparatively stable lexical unit that represents the basic ideological views and values in the language and that plays a special role in totalitarian language; the other interpretation views it as a unit of any language (or even text) level the function of which is explication of the system of ideological dominants.

However, we believe that the described phenomenon is, first of all, a *mental and cognitive unit* (this view does not contradict Bakhtin’s interpretation of an ideologeme), *of ideological worldview which is found in the text (including creolized texts) and even in discourse in the form of language units belonging to different levels of the language system and also in the form of signs from other semiotic systems.*

In our opinion, ideologeme should not be limited to a word or any other language unit. Probably the word is the most typical means of ideologeme representation, but it is *not the only* possible variant.

Such “cognitive-based” approach to the phenomenon under study is found in the works by N.I. Klushina and A.A. Miroshnichenko.

The latter, being the author of the linguo-ideological method of analysis [Miroshnichenko 1995], suggests identifying two units *lingveme* and *ideologeme* defining them as “praxeme of a language” and “praxeme of consciousness” accordingly.

A value-based language correlation that appears between an ideologeme and a lingveme is called by the author a linguo-ideologeme; the author of this approach underlines that it is a material and a product of linguo-ideological paradigms.

From the point of view of A.A. Miroshnichenko, a certain ideologeme (in its metaphysi-

cal and axiological meanings) is expressed by a certain lingveme. "It means that an *ideologeme* is a concept, while a *lingveme* is an indicator of *linguo-ideologeme*". It should be mentioned that A.A. Miroshnichenko emphasizes that lingveme, i.e. a means of language representation of an ideologeme, is "any unit of language, as well as any syntactical or semantic relation in language... The meaningful absence of the proper language unit or relation (ellipsis) may also serve as an indicator of *linguo-ideologeme*" [Miroshnichenko 1995].

N.I. Klushina defines ideologeme through the paradigm of communicative stylistics, which determines the view of the linguist on this phenomenon.

She defines ideologeme "as a central concept of publicism", "as a unit of communicative stylistics", "the basic intentional category of a publicistic text and publicistic discourse", which gives a "certain ideological modus to a publicistic text"; finally, an ideologeme is analyzed within the paradigm of communicative stylistics — it is "the main idea that has political, economic or social meaning, for the sake of which the text is written" [Klushina 2008: 38-39].

The latter of the definitions seems too vague and imprecise, however this approach is also important for this research as: in an attempt to differentiate the notions of *ideologeme*, *concept* and *mental stereotype*, N.I. Klushina admits that, firstly, they are units of the same level — mental and cognitive; secondly, the ideologeme, as well as the concept and mental stereotype, is represented in the scope of the texts of a certain discourse.

Yet, according to N.I. Klushina linguistic representation of an ideologeme is realized via verbal means such as "worldview-driven general word, more often a figurative word or metaphor bearing a strong suggestive potential" [Klushina 2008: 38]. This statement, in our opinion, limits the potential of ideologeme representation: probably it would be better to talk about *the main* way of linguistic representation of an ideologeme on the lexico-semantic level and to underline the fact that it is true primarily for print media texts.

To be fair, we should mention that N.I. Klushina names some more ways of "a certain idea (ideologeme)" representation in a publicistic text. They are: "author's evaluation, interpretation of reality, nomination and stylistic manner of narration chosen by the addresser (verbal aggression, approval or emphasized objectiveness)" [Klushina 2008: 5].

In general, differentiation between such cognitive universals as ideologeme, concept and mental stereotype in the thesis by N.I. Klushina is undertaken, in our opinion, for practical

purposes. Even within the frames of one research, the notions are often interrelated, and it is impossible to define one of them without the use of the other (which is determined by the proximity of these cognitive units, especially the notions *ideologeme* and *concept*) and to work out a classification in which these notions would reveal differences when classified *on the same grounds*.

So, from the point of view of this study, **ideologeme** is a unit of the cognitive level — a certain multi-level concept, in the structure of which (in the nucleus or on the periphery) there are ideologically marked conceptual features that embody collective, and often stereotypical or mythological interpretation of power, state, society, political and ideological institutions that exists in the minds of native speakers.

Ideologeme is a mental unit that is characterized by national specificity, dynamic semantics, strong evaluative potential, and frequency and variety of ways of representation via signs of different semiotic systems, primarily of the language system.

The use of verbal markers of an ideologeme — keyword, cliché, metaphors, etc. — is one of the main ways of its verbal realization.

Ideologemes are found not only in basic discourses (ideological, political, mass media and publicistic), but also in a number of other discourses: advertising, sport, educational, scientific, religious, entertaining, everyday and others; however, even within the frames of most of types of discourses in which ideologeme is not a conceptual dominant, it still performs its main function — "the author's purposeful manipulation of an addressee (reader)" [Kupina 2003: 269].

It should be underlined that in different periods of the country's history, the scope of ideologemes may be different and may include concepts that are not connected with ideology or politics. It happens when an ideological feature becomes prominent in the structure of a concept (for instance, ideologization of the concepts GOSPODIN (sir) and TOVARISHCH (comrade) in the Soviet period; or ideological connotation of the concepts SOVETSKY BALET (Soviet ballet), SOVETSKY UCHENY (Soviet scholar), and SOVETSKOYE YAZYKOZNANIE (Soviet Linguistics). Contemporary discursive tendencies in the sphere of politics and mass media make it possible to say that the concept SPORT is highly ideologically charged at this stage).

## 2. Classification of ideologemes

Development of classification of ideologemes, or their typology is probably as complicated as determination of the semantic boarders of this phenomenon.

As it frequently happens in the development of any classification, one of the most important issues is identification of correct and precise grounds for this classification and determination of the “main” or “leading” ground for classification.

In modern linguistic research works we find some typological and generic classifications of ideologemes, the peculiarities of which are determined by the aim and object of research or scientific area they belong to.

In his study of functioning of ideologemes-words, A.P. Chudinov has singled out *two main kinds of ideologemes* depending on their usage by the members of different political parties and movements.

The ideologemes of the first kind “are interpreted differently by the members of different political groups” [Chudinov 2007: 92], which is manifested in the emotional coloring of the word onto which “evaluation of the phenomenon is transferred” [ibid.]. The linguist provides the following example: the ideologemes *narod* (people) and *svoboda* (freedom) are frequent in discourses of different political parties, but their meanings may be different and depend on political views of the speakers.

The ideologemes of the second kind “are used only by the supporters of certain political views; they show the attitude to the phenomenon named” [Chudinov 2007: 93]. Thus, the linguist gives the following examples: the ideologeme *strany narodnoy demokratii* (countries of people’s democracy) is frequent in the Soviet political language and has a positive axiological connotation there, and the ideologeme *sovetskiye satellity* (Soviet satellites) is frequent in the language of political dissidents and has a negative axiological connotation.

From the point of view of publicistic discourse, N.I. Klushina singles out several types of ideologemes: *social* ideologemes and *personal* ideologemes.

Social ideologemes are cognitive phenomena that “reflect the views and beliefs of the society at a certain stage of its development” [Klushina 2008: 39], N.I. Klushina also describes different kinds of social ideologemes from the point of view of their “temporal features” (and thus — from the point of view of the urgency of ideologemes and, consequently, their frequency and different ways of their representation).

So, on the “axis of time” we find “historical, contemporary and futurological ideologemes that reflect the history and the search for ideas important for the development of society (for example, the historical ideologemes *derzhava* (state) and *messianism* (messianism) and the futurological ideologeme *natsionalnaya ideya* (national idea))” [Klushina 2008: 40].

“Personal ideologemes”, according to N.I. Klushina, are built around any state leader, any prominent political leader and heroes/anti-heroes of the time. Personal ideologemes are based on the image of every head of the country, from “tzar” to a president. Such ideologemes sink into mass consciousness in the form of stereotypes constructed by mass media; the following personal ideologemes are found: *vozhd’ mirovogo proletariata* (leader of the world’s proletariat) — about Lenin, *genialny vozhd’ i uchitel* (ingenious leader and teacher) — about Stalin, *genialny konstruktor* (ingenious engineer — about Khrushchev), *verny leninets* (loyal Lenin’s disciple) — about Brezhnev, *arkhitektor perestroiki* (perestroika architect) — about Gorbachev, *tsar Boris* — about Yeltsin, etc.” [Klushina 2008: 40].

We do not have any serious objections against the abovementioned classifications of ideologemes, but we would like to comment on the choice of terms and, moreover, on the meaning of the terms in the given context.

If we proceed from the usual meaning of the word “social” (“public, referring to the lives of people and their relations in society” [Ozhegov, Shvedova 1995: 741]), then the use of this word to name a group of *ideologemes* does not seem perfect, as any ideologeme, even a personal one, is socially significant due to the peculiarity of this concept.

Besides, temporal characteristics is not a prerogative of the so-called social ideologemes: personal ideologemes, as it follows from the given examples, may be classified on the scale of past/present.

It seems that the author wanted to emphasize the differences in the nature of the cognitive categories under description, although she did not attempt at linguo-cognitive analysis of the phenomenon. Thus, social ideologemes (even if we take into account that ideologemes of a totalitarian language undergo “simplification”, “stereotypization” and desemantization of not only language means of expression but also of conceptual features of the mental universal) are *abstract* (in terms of I.A. Sternin) concepts — *concepts-notions*, *concepts-frames* or *concepts-gestalts* and they make either a concept consisting of the “more general essential features of an object or phenomenon, the result of reflection and comprehension” (*notion*), or “mental multi-component concept in the unity of its constituent elements, a multidimensional image, a sum total of standard knowledge about an object or phenomenon” (*frame*), or “a complex, integral functional structure that puts the diversity of separate phenomena in order in the mind” (*Gestalt*) [Popova, Sternin 2003: 72-74].

Anyway, we realize that when analyzing different kinds of “social” ideologemes it is often impossible to establish which group of *abstract concepts* it belongs to, but the abstract nature of information incorporated in the ideological phenomenon, and, moreover, the multi-layer structure of the cognitive pattern of the concept are important features of such ideologemes.

Personal ideologemes in their turn or “ideological vocatives” (the term used by T.V. Shkaiderova) — concepts of the precedent names of political leaders — are the “main components of the nucleolus of knowledge and representation” [Shkaiderova 2007: 117] and they possess the qualities of such universal as archetype [for more details see Jung 1987: 229, Kuzmina 1999: 193].

The characteristic of personal ideologemes as ideologemes-archetypes is justified by the fact that they help ideological worldview to get the features of a mythological one. This fact, by the way, is mentioned by almost all researchers of the Soviet totalitarian discourse, including N.I. Klushina, who argues that “any ideologeme risks to become a mythologeme, as mass media propagate a certain ideology. The restraint mechanism here is freedom of speech, free access to information and existence of publications expressing different political views” [Klushina 2008: 41]. In contemporary Russian political discourse the recent tendency of “demythologization” of ideologemes-archetypes and some other kinds of ideologemes is replaced by the “new cycle” of mythologization of these units due to the change of extralinguistic factors [Kuzmina 2007, Malysheva 2009].

So, the undertaken analysis proves that linguists single out those types of ideologemes that are relevant to the scientific area they do their research in or to the goals of their study. But even in this case it is often impossible to eliminate the “plurality” of criteria used in the classification of the phenomenon under analysis.

Our study does not purport to provide a comprehensively complete classification of ideologemes, but we have worked out one based on some essential grounds.

Thus, to classify ideologemes, it is important to take into account the following characteristics: topicality/out-of-datedness of an ideologeme in modern ideological worldview and in contemporary discourses of different types (first of all political and publicistic and also those that are closely connected with them); and the peculiarities of pragmatic and communicative characteristics of an ideologeme (axiological features of the content of ideologeme, peculiarities of its comprehension by the native speakers, etc.).

This classification, as well as the other few classifications that are present today, is not perfect and may be criticized, but it is useful for this research as it provides additional information about the types of ideologemes.

So, we have worked out the classification based on the following grounds:

1. According to the *nature of conceptualized information*:

**ideologeme-notion** (*people, flag, hymn, democracy*);

**ideologeme-frame** (*Olympic Games, sport, congress, the State Duma*);

**ideologeme-gestalt** (*freedom, equality*);

**ideologeme-archetype** (*Lenin, Stalin, Brezhnev, Gorbachev, Yeltsin, Putin, Nikolay II*).

2. According to the *sphere of usage and comprehension by native speakers*:

**common ideologemes interpreted differently** (*people, freedom, Russia*);

**common ideologemes interpreted in the same way** (*sport, fatherland, hymn*);

**special ideologemes interpreted in the same way** (*Soviet soldiers-rescuers (cf. invader)*).

3. According to the *pragmatic component* (axiological potential, peculiarity of comprehension by native speakers including those who support different political parties):

**ideologemes with a positive axiological mode** (*Motherland, flag, fatherland*);

**ideologemes with a negative axiological mode** (*terror, fascism*);

**ideologemes with a mixed axiological mode** (*patriotism, president, will, democracy, people*).

4. According to *topicality / outdatedness of ideologeme in contemporary ideological worldview*:

**ideologeme-historism** (*Soviet people, socialist competition, Communist party, tsar*);

**new ideologeme (or modern ideologeme)** (*financial crisis, peace-enforcement, national idea, tolerance, extremism, Crimea, pension reform*);

**reactualized ideologeme** (*Governor, Duma*);

**universal ideologeme** (*Motherland, flag, hymn, patriotism*).

It is necessary to describe this classification in greater detail.

We believe that all ideologemes can be subdivided into two groups: common ideologemes and special ideologemes. This statement correlates with the view of A.P. Chudinov, who writes about ideologemes used by the speakers-representatives of different political parties and movements, i.e. *common ideolo-*

*gemes*. At the same time there is a description of another group of ideologemes, which “express a specific view on a certain phenomenon” and thus “they are used only by supporters of certain political views” [Chudinov 2007: 93]. Such ideologemes may be called *special ideologemes*. And if common ideologemes may be associated with various cognitive features by native speakers (which depends on the political views of the speaker), special ideologemes always have a constant set of cognitive properties as they are used only by the members of one political group, or the advocates of the same political views. It is interesting that the conceptual nucleus of a special ideologeme as a rule coincides with the conceptual nucleus of another special ideologeme, which names the same phenomenon in the “political vocabulary” of another party or political movement. The essential difference between special ideologemes always touches upon their conceptual layers, in which pragmatic and evaluative connotation about the object/phenomenon is found, which is reflected in the pragmatic macro-component of the verbal marker of the special ideologeme — a keyword or key phrase. The following examples can illustrate our ideas: the ideologemes *soviet soldier-rescuer* in the contemporary publicistic and political discourses in Russia and *invader* in the discourses of the same kind in Poland, Baltic States, Ukraine, etc. are characterized by the same denotatum, but they have opposite pragmatic connotations; cf. *terrorists in Syria* — in modern Russian media and *liberal opposition* in modern American media; *Chechen terrorists* — in Russian mass media and *Chechen freedom fighters* in American mass media.

It is natural, and this fact is underlined by many scholars, that ideologemes of this type are used primarily as a tool of manipulation of mass consciousness and as a means of transformation of the addressee’s worldview. Thus, words that represent similar cognitive units in a language are called *pragmemes* by M.N. Epstein; he defines this concept as “self-notional” words “that assess their own thingness and objectify their evaluativity”, in the lexical meaning of which “semantic aspect — relation of the word to the named phenomenon — is closely connected with its pragmatic aspect — the attitude of the speaker towards the subject ... Such words as *objectivism, idealism, opportunism, vigilantism, conspiracy, feverish, inveterate, accomplice, close up* on the one hand, and *objectivity, materialism, pacifism, initiative, commonwealth, quick, experienced, ally, team up* on the other hand may act as complete communicative units” [Epstein 1991: 19-33].

As different from the view of A.P. Chudinov, we believe it is possible to identify one more

type of ideologemes on the basis of the sphere of their usage and peculiarities of comprehension by the speaker.

These are common ideologemes of “universal” nature, the meaning of which is understood in the same way by almost all native speakers regardless of their political views.

The number of such phenomena in contemporary Russian political and ideological worldviews is very small, but we believe they do exist; we may name the following: *the Great Patriotic War*, and, since recently, *flag* and *hymn*, as well as *sport* — these ideologemes are frequent, common and they have the same “set” of conceptual features and the same ideological structure for most native speakers. They have positive connotations.

We suppose that the list of such ideologemes is culture-bound (this is probably a constitutive feature of ideologemes in general), and is determined by geopolitical and socio-economic conditions of development of the society. In our opinion, American ideological worldview includes the following “universal” ideologemes: *hymn, flag, democracy and elections*. It is clear that the classifying features of ideologemes are not constant and they may vary and adjust to extralinguistic factors.

As for the third group of ideologemes in our classification, we think it is important to comment on the ideologemes with a mixed axiological mode. This group includes common ideologemes, the axiological mode in the meaning of which may be different — from positive to neutral and even negative.

Thus, many texts of the so-called “civil journalism” circulating in social networks, blogs, etc. are different from “official” political and publicistic discourses as they show a negative attitude to such ideological phenomena as *president, power, Russia, and Russian* on all language levels; but they express a positive attitude to such ideologemes as *socialism, communism, Soviet Union*, and some others. Admittedly, the “variation” of the pragmatic component of an ideologeme does not always depend on political views of the speaker.

The “plurality” of evaluation reflected in linguistic representation of an ideologeme is often explained by a complex of extralinguistic factors such as the socio-political and economic situation in the country and the world, as well as the political atmosphere in society, and many others. A good example of such ideologeme is *patriotism*, the axiological mode of which has always been ambiguous in the Russian ideological worldview [Sandomirskaya 2001, Gavrilova 2005, Deklenko 2003, Nozhenko 2008, Odesky, Feldman 2008, and others], the other examples are the ideologeme *USSR* or the “per-

sonal ideologeme” *Brezhnev* the axiological mode of which is changing due to the transformation of the attitude to the “epoch of stagnation” in society.

The fourth group of ideologemes is extremely important in our classification as it includes ideologemes the characteristics of which depend on the topicality / outdatedness of the phenomenon named from the point of view of contemporary ideological worldview.

Thus taking into account the socio-political life in the Russian ideological worldview we singled out *ideologemes-historisms* — ideologemes that are irrelevant in contemporary political and publicistic discourses and which are used to illustrate historical events or in case of search for “historical correspondent” to modern ideological realia (compare the frequency of references to the Russian empire and the Soviet Union in the context of potential and real might of modern Russia; USSR is also mentioned in the context of achievements in sport).

The group of *new ideologemes* or *modern ideologemes* includes phenomena that are known to the majority of native speakers, common and actively used in political and other discourses of post-Soviet Russia, such as *legal state, national self-consciousness, modernization, pension reform, etc.* Worthy of note is that the list of modern ideologemes is rather heterogeneous and unstable; the border between this group and the others is blurred and changeable.

At the same time, it should be mentioned that the content and evaluative meanings typical of ideologemes of different types are determined first of all by the peculiarities of the socio-political structure of the country, “typology” of governmental bodies, and geopolitical and economic situation in the world.

One more kind of ideologemes should be singled out due to the influence of the socio-political situation on the ideological worldview — they may be called **universal ideologemes** present in ideological worldview disregard of socio-political structure and views of political elite.

At the same time, in spite of the undeniable urgency of such ideological phenomena, the semantics of universal ideologemes and their axiological mode correlate with the “system of values” existing at a certain period of time and with political and ideological beliefs of the native speakers including those belonging to the ruling party.

It should be underlined one more time: the system of universal ideologemes is a set of “ideological invariables”, which, regardless of the change of their content and, consequently, the means of their verbal representation, are always up-to-date, topical and popular among

the members of different political parties and the national linguo-cultural community at large.

By the way, the universal nature of these phenomena lies in the fact that they have similar features in other ideological worldviews, different from Russian, due to their ideological invariability, although they may be different in a number of specific conceptual features and consequently in the frequent ways of representation in a language.

Among the universal ideologemes of the Russian ideological worldview we may find the concepts PATRIOTISM, MOTHERLAND, FLAG, HYMN, RUSSIA, and NATIONAL CHARACTER. We believe that a prominent role in the contemporary Russian (and not only Russian) ideological worldview is played by the universal ideologeme SPORT, which has essential cognitive differences from the abovementioned kinds of ideologemes, although it may be classified on the same grounds [Malysheva 2010].

#### REFERENCES

1. Alekseev K. A. Sports Component of the Image of the Country [Electronic resource] // State / Region Image: Modern Approaches: New Ideas in the Theory and Practice of Communication : collection of articles, scientific works. — Vol. 3 / resp. ed. D. P. Gavra. — S. Peterburg : Rose of the World, 2009. [Sportivnaya sostavlyayushchaya imidzha strany [Elektronnyy resurs] // Imidzh gosudarstva/regiona: sovremennyye podkhody: novye idei v teorii i praktike kommunikatsii : sb. nauch. trudov. — Vyp. 3 /otv. red. D. P. Gavra. — SPb. : Roza mira, 2009]. URL: <https://pravo33.wordpress.com/2010/02/16> (date of access: 27.09.2018). — (In Rus.)
2. Bart R. Mythologies. — Moscow : Publishing House of Sabashnikov, 1996. 312 p. [Mifologii. — M. : Izd-vo Sabashnikovoykh, 1996. 312 s.]. — (In Rus.)
3. Bakhtin M. M. Word in the Novel // Questions of Literature and Aesthetics / M. M. Bakhtin. — M. : Fiction, 1975. [Slovo v romane // Voprosy literatury i estetiki / M. M. Bakhtin. — M. : Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1975]. — (In Rus.)
4. Bakhtin M. M. Problems of Dostoevsky’s Creativity. — Moscow : Alkonost, 1994. 172 p. [Problemy tvorchestva Dostoevskogo. — M. : Alkonost, 1994. 172 s.]. — (In Rus.)
5. Gavrilova M. V. The Concept of “Patriotism” in the Russian Political Discourse of the Beginning of the XXI Century // New Russia: new Phenomena in the Language and Science of Language : materials of All-Russian scientific conf. (Ekaterinburg, April 14—16, 2005) / [ed. L. G. Babenko]. — Ekaterinburg : Ural Univ. Pr., 2005. P. 489—497. [Ponyatie «patriotizm» v russkom politicheskom diskurse nachala KhKhI veka // Novaya Rossiya: novye yavleniya v yazyke i nauke o yazyke : materialy Vseros. nauch. konf. (Ekaterinburg, 14—16 apr. 2005g.) / [pod red. L. G. Babenko]. — Ekaterinburg : Izd-vo. Ural. un-ta, 2005. S. 489—497]. — (In Rus.)
6. Guseynov G. Ch. D. S. P. Soviet Ideologemes in the Russian Discourse of the 1990s. — Moscow : Three squares, 2004. 273 p. [D. S. P. Sovetskie ideologemy v russkom diskurse 1990-kh. — M. : Tri kvadrata, 2004. 273 s.]. — (In Rus.)
7. Guseynov G. Ch. Map of our Motherland: Ideology between Word and Body. — Moscow : O.G.I., 2005. 216 p. [Karta nashey rodiny: ideologema mezhdru slovom i telom. — M. : O.G.I., 2005. 216 s.]. — (In Rus.)
8. Deklenko E. V. The Concept of “Patriotism” in a Comparative Aspect // Linguistics: Bulletin of Ural Linguist. Society / resp. ed. A. P. Chudinov. — Ekaterinburg : Ural. State Ped. Univ. Pr., 2003. Vol. 11. P. 28—32. [Kontsept «patriotizm» v sopostavitel’nom aspekte // Lingvistika : byul. Ural. lingvist. o-va / otv. red. A. P. Chudinov. — Ekaterinburg : Ural. gos. ped. un-t, 2003. T. 11. S. 28—32]. — (In Rus.)



9. Zemskaya E. A. Cliche of Newspeak and Citation in the Language of the Post-Soviet Society // *Issues of Linguistics*. 1996. № 1. S. 67—79. [Klishhe novoyaza i tsitatsiya v yazyke postsovetovskogo obshchestva // *Voprosy yazykoznaniiya*. 1996. № 1. S. 67—79]. — (In Rus.)
10. Klushina N. I. General Features of Publicistic Style // *Language of the Media as an Object of Interdisciplinary Research / resp. ed. M. N. Volodina*. — Moscow : Moscow State Univ. Publishing House, 2003. P. 269—289. [Obshchie osobennosti publitsisticheskogo stilya // *Yazyk SMI kak ob"ekt mezhdistsiplinarnogo issledovaniya / otv. red. M. N. Volodina*. — M. : Izd-vo MGU, 2003. S. 269—289]. — (In Rus.)
11. Klushina N. I. Intentional Categories of Journalistic Text (on the Material of Periodicals 2000—2008) : synopsis of Doctoral thesis ... of Doctor of Philology. — Moscow, 2008. 62 p. [Intentsional'nye kategorii publitsisticheskogo teksta (na materiale periodicheskikh izdaniy 2000—2008 gg.) : avtoref. dis. ... d-ra filol. nauk. — M., 2008. 62 s.]. — (In Rus.)
12. Kosikov G. K. "A Rebel Man" and "A Sensitive Man" (M. M. Bakhtin and R. Barth) // *Faces of Time : collection of articles*. — Moscow : Yustitsinform : Philol. Department of Moscow State University n. a. M. V. Lomonosov, 2009. P. 8—25. [«Chelovek buntuyushchiy» i «chelovek chuvstvitel'nyy» (M. M. Bakhtin i R. Bart) // *Liki vremeni : sb. statey*. — M. : Yustitsinform : Filol. fak. MGU im. M. V. Lomonosova, 2009. S. 8—25]. — (In Rus.)
13. Kuz'mina N. A. Intertext and Its Role in the Processes of Evolution of the Poetic Language : monograph. — Ekaterinburg : Publ. house of Ural. Univ. — Omsk : Omsk. Univ., 1999. 268 p. [Intertekst i ego rol' v protsessakh evolyutsii poeticheskogo yazyka : monogr. — Ekaterinburg : Izd-vo Ural. un-ta. — Omsk : Omsk. un-t, 1999. 268 s.]. — (In Rus.)
14. Kuz'mina N. A. Deideologization or New Ideologization? (Ideologies of the New Time) // *Language and Style of Modern Media: intercollege collection of scientific papers : All-Russia. conf., dedicated to 80th anniversary of prof. N. S. Valgina*. — Moscow, 2007. P. 192—198. [Deideologizatsiya ili novaya ideologizatsiya? (Ideologiya novogo vremeni) // *Yazyk i stil' sovremennykh sredstv massovoy informatsii : mezhdvuz. sb. nauch. tr. Vseros. konf., posvyashch. 80-letiyu prof. N. S. Valginoy*. — M., 2007. S. 192—198]. — (In Rus.)
15. Kupina N. A. Totalitarian Language: Vocabulary and Speech Reactions. — Ekaterinburg ; Perm : Publ. House of Ural. Univ. : ZUUNTS, 1995. 144 p. [Totalitarnyy yazyk: slovar' i rechevye reaksii. — Ekaterinburg ; Perm' : Izd-vo Ural. un-ta : ZUUNTS, 1995. 144 s.]. — (In Rus.)
16. Kupina N. A. Language Construction: from the System of Ideologies to the System of Culture // *Russian Language Today*. Iss. 1 / RAS. Inst. of Rus. language named after V. V. Vinogradov / resp. ed. L.P. Krysin. — M.: Azbukovnik, 2000. P. 182—189. [Yazykovoe stroitel'stvo: ot sistemy ideologem k sisteme kul'turem // *Russkiy yazyk segodnya*. Vyp. 1 / RAN. In-t rus. yaz. im. V. V. Vinogradova / otv. red. L. P. Krysin. — M. : Azbukovnik, 2000. S. 182—189]. — (In Rus.)
17. Kupina N. A. Living Ideological Processes and Problems of the Culture of Speech // *Language. System. Personality*. — Ekaterinburg : Ural. State Ped. Univ. Pr., 2005. P. 90—104. [Zhivye ideologicheskie protsessy i problemy kul'tury rechi // *Yazyk. Sistema. Lichnost'*. — Ekaterinburg : Ural. gos. ped. un-t, 2005. S. 90—104]. — (In Rus.)
18. Malysheva E. G. Concept 'Governor' in the Regional Mass Information Discourse (on the material of the texts of the radio and television media of the Omsk region) // *Political linguistics*. 2009. Vol. 2 (28). P. 76—86. [Kontsept 'Gubernator' v regional'nom massovo-informatsionnom diskurse (na materiale tekstov radiynykh i televizionnykh SMI Omskoy oblasti) // *Politicheskaya lingvistika*. 2009. Vyp. 2 (28). S. 76—86]. — (In Rus.)
19. Malysheva E. G. Universal Ideology 'Sport': Ethnocultural Specificity // *Political linguistics*. 2010. Iss. 3 (33). P. 163—170. [Universal'naya ideologema 'Sport': etnokul'turnaya spetsifika // *Politicheskaya lingvistika*. 2010. Vyp. 3 (33). S. 163—170]. — (In Rus.)
20. Miroshnichenko A. A. Lingvo-ideological Analysis of the Language of Mass Communications : synopsis of thesis ... of Cand. of Philology. — Rostov on Don, 1996. 16 p. [Lingvo-ideologicheskiy analiz yazyka massovykh kommunikatsiy : avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. — Rostov n/D, 1996. 16 s.]. — (In Rus.)
21. The Newest Philosophical Dictionary / A. A. Gritsanov, M. A. Mozheiko, T. G. Romyantseva, A. I. Mertsalova, and others. - M.: Book House, 2003. 1280 p. [Novyeshiy filosofskiy slovar' / A. A. Gritsanov, M. A. Mozheiko, T. G. Romyantseva, A. I. Mertsalova i dr. — M. : Knizhnyy dom, 2003. 1280 s.]. — (In Rus.)
22. Novikova T. Analysis of the Principles of Tolerance in the Texts of the Media [Electronic resource] // *RELGA : scientific-culturological journ*. 2006. No. 21 (143). [Analiz printsipov tolerantnosti v tekstakh SMI [Elektronnyy resurs] // *RELGA : nauch.-kul'turologich. zhurn*. 2006. № 21 (143)]. URL: <http://www.relga.ru/Environ/WebObjects/tgu-www.woa/wa/Main?extid=1314&level1=main&level2=articles> (date of access: 05.07.2018).
23. Nozhenko E. V. Ethnocultural Specificity of Stereotypes-concepts of National Character: "Self-confidence", "Patriotism", "Success" of American Linguistic Culture : synopsis of thesis ... of Cand. of Philology. — Kemerovo, 2008. 23 p. [Etnokul'turnaya spetsifika stereotipov-kontseptov natsional'nogo kharaktera: «Uverenost' v sebe», «Patriotizm», «Uspeshnost'» amerikanskoj lingvokul'tury : avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. — Kemerovo, 2008. 23 s.]. — (In Rus.)
24. Odesskiy M. P., Fel'dman D. M. The Ideologeme "Patriot" in Russian, Soviet and Post-Soviet Culture // *Social Sciences and Modernity*. 2008. No. 1. P. 109—123. [Ideologema «patriot» v russkoj, sovetsoj i postsovetsoj kul'ture // *Obshchestvennyye nauki i sovremennost'*. 2008. № 1. S. 109—123]. — (In Rus.)
25. Ozhegov S. I., Shvedova N. Yu. Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language. — Moscow : AZ, 1995. 928 p. [Tolkovyy slovar' russkogo yazyka. — M. : "AZ", 1995. 928 s.]. — (In Rus.)
26. Popova Z. D., Stermin I. A. Essays on Cognitive Linguistics. — Voronezh : Origins, 2003. 192 p. [Ocherki po kognitivnoy lingvistike. — Voronezh : Istoki, 2003. 192 s.]. — (In Rus.)
27. Radbil' T. B. Mythology of Andrei Platonov's Language : monogr. — Moscow ; Low Novgorod : Publishing House of the NGPU, 1998. 116 p. [Mifologiya yazyka Andreyia Platonova : monogr. — M. ; N. Novgorod : Izd-vo NGPU, 1998. 116 s.]. — (In Rus.)
28. Sandomirskaya I. The Book of the Motherland: Experience in the Analysis of Discursive Practices [Electronic resource] // *Wiener slawistischer Almanach Linguistische Reihe Herausgegeben Von Tilmann Reuther Sonderband. 50*. Vienna, 2001. [Kniga o Rodine: opyt analiza diskursivnykh praktik [Elektronnyy resurs] // *Wiener slawistischer Almanach Linguistische Reihe Herausgegeben Von Tilmann Reuther Sonderband. 50*. Wien, 2001]. URL: <http://yanko.lib.ru/books/cultur/sadomirskaya-rodina.htm> (date of access: 13.07.2009).
29. Torokhova M. V. Ideologeme "Terror" in the Hebrew-speaking Palestinian periodicals of 1946—1948 : thesis ... of Cand. of Philology. — Moscow, 2006. 189 p. [Ideologema «Terror» v ivritoyazychnoy palestinskoj periodike 1946—1948 gg. : dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. — M., 2006. 189 s.]. — (In Rus.)
30. Shkayderova T. V. The Soviet Ideological Picture of the World: Subjects, Time, Space (on the material of the headlines of the Pravda newspaper of the 1930s – 40s) : thesis ... of Cand. of Philology. — Omsk, 2007. 237 p. [Sovetskaya ideologicheskaya kartina mira: sub"ekty, vremya, prostranstvo (na materiale zagolovkov gazety «Pravda» 30—40-kg gg.) : dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. — Omsk, 2007. 237 s.]. — (In Rus.)
31. Shestov N. I. The Political Myth Now and Before / ed. A. I. Demidov. — Moscow : OLMA-PRESS, 2005. 412 p. [Politicheskij myf teper' i prezhe / Pod red. A. I. Demidova. — Moskva: OLMA-PRESS, 2005. 412 s.]. — (In Rus.)
32. Chudinov A. P. Political Linguistics : teaching aid. — Moscow : Flinta : Science, 2007. 254 p. [Politicheskaya lingvistika. Uchebnoe posobie. — Moskva: Flinta: Nauka, 2007. — 254 s.]. — (In Rus.)
33. Epshteyn M. N. Ideology and Language // *Problems of Linguistics*. 1991. № 6. S. 19—33. [Ideologiya i yazyk // *Voprosy yazykoznaniiya*. 1991. № 6. S. 19—33]. — (In Rus.)
34. Yung K.-G. On the Relation of Analytical Psychology to Poetic and Artistic Creativity // *Foreign Aesthetics and the Theory of Literature of the XIX — XX Centuries : treatises, articles, essays*. — Moscow : Publishing House of Moscow. Univ., 1987. P. 228—232. [Ob otnoshenii analiticheskoy psikhologii k poetiko-khudozhestvennomu tvorchestvu // *Zarubezhnaya estetika i teoriya literatury XIX—XX vv. : traktaty, stat'i, esse*. — M. : Izd-vo Moskov. un-ta, 1987. S. 228—232]. — (In Rus.)

Е. Г. Малышева

Омский государственный университет им. Ф. М. Достоевского, Омск, Россия

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4513-5086

И. С. Пирожкова (перевод с русского языка)

Уральский государственный педагогический университет, Екатеринбург, Россия

ORCID ID: —

✉ E-mail: malysheva\_eg@mail.ru.

## Идеологема как лингвокогнитивный феномен: определение и классификация

**АННОТАЦИЯ.** Статья посвящена проблеме определения чрезвычайно значимого для современной лингвистики, в том числе политической, понятия — идеологема. В ходе исследования устанавливается, феномены какого порядка и уровня могут называться идеологемами, т. е. выполнять функцию репрезентации идеологии, являться «формой идеологии», идеологическим «знаком». Доказывается возможность рассмотрения идеологема как особого типа многоуровневого концепта, в когнитивной структуре которого выделяются идеологически маркированные концептуальные носители языка о власти, государстве, нации, гражданском обществе, политических и идеологических институтах. Идеологема — мыслительная, когнитивная универсалия, единица идеологической картины мира, которая объективируется в тексте (в том числе в тексте креолизованном) и — шире — в дискурсе собственно языковыми единицами разных уровней, а также знаками других семиотических систем. Кроме того, в настоящей статье предпринимается попытка классификации идеологема по четырем разным основаниям: характер концептуализируемой информации; сфера употребления и понимания носителями языка; прагматический компонент; актуальность/неактуальность идеологема в современной идеологической картине мира. Данная классификация дополняет и уточняет уже имеющиеся в научной литературе представления о типах идеологема.

**КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА:** когнитивная лингвистика; идеологема; концепт; классификация идеологема.

**ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ:** Малышева Елена Григорьевна, доктор филологических наук, доцент, ведущий кафедрой журналистики и медиалингвистики, факультет филологии и медиакоммуникаций, Омский государственный университет им. Ф. М. Достоевского; 644077, Россия, г. Омск, пр-т Мира, д. 55-а; e-mail: malysheva\_eg@mail.ru.

**ИНФОРМАЦИЯ О ПЕРЕВОДЧИКЕ:** Пирожкова Ирина Сергеевна, кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры межкультурной коммуникации, риторики и РКИ, Институт филологии, культурологи и межкультурной коммуникации, Уральский государственный педагогический университет; 620017, Россия, г. Екатеринбург, пр-т Космонавтов, 26; e-mail: irene22@live.ru.

**ДЛЯ ЦИТИРОВАНИЯ:** Малышева, Е. Г. Идеологема как лингвокогнитивный феномен: определение и классификация / Е. Г. Малышева; пер. на англ. яз. И. С. Пирожковой // Политическая лингвистика. — 2019. — № 1 (73). — С. 134—144.

### ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Алексеев К. А. Спортивная составляющая имиджа страны [Электронный ресурс] // Имидж государства/региона: современные подходы: новые идеи в теории и практике коммуникации : сб. науч. трудов. — Вып. 3 /отв. ред. Д. П. Гавра. — СПб. : Роза мира, 2009. URL: <https://pravo33.wordpress.com/2010/02/16> (дата обращения: 27.09.2018).
2. Барт Р. Мифологии. — М. : Изд-во Сабашниковых, 1996. 312 с.
3. Бахтин М. М. Слово в романе // Вопросы литературы и эстетики / М. М. Бахтин. — М. : Художественная литература, 1975.
4. Бахтин М. М. Проблемы творчества Достоевского. — М. : Алконост, 1994. 172 с.
5. Гаврилова М. В. Понятие «патриотизм» в русском политическом дискурсе начала XXI века // Новая Россия: новые явления в языке и науке о языке : материалы Всерос. науч. конф. (Екатеринбург, 14—16 апр. 2005г.) / [под ред. Л. Г. Бабенко]. — Екатеринбург : Изд-во. Урал. ун-та, 2005. С. 489—497.
6. Гусейнов Г. Ч. Д. С. П. Советские идеологема в русском дискурсе 1990-х. — М. : Три квадрата, 2004. 273 с.
7. Гусейнов Г. Ч. Карта нашей родины: идеологема между словом и телом. — М. : О.Г.И., 2005. 216 с.
8. Декленко Е. В. Концепт «патриотизм» в сопоставительном аспекте // Лингвистика : биол. Урал. лингвист. о-ва / отв. ред. А. П. Чудинов. — Екатеринбург : Урал. гос. пед. ун-т, 2003. Т. 11. С. 28—32.
9. Земская Е. А. Клише новояза и цитация в языке постсоветского общества // Вопросы языкознания. 1996. № 1. С. 67—79.
10. Клушина Н. И. Общие особенности публицистического стиля // Язык СМИ как объект междисциплинарного исследования / отв. ред. М. Н. Володина. — М. : Изд-во МГУ, 2003. С. 269—289.
11. Клушина Н. И. Интенциональные категории публицистического текста (на материале периодических изданий 2000—2008 гг.): автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. — М., 2008. 62 с.
12. Косиков Г. К. «Человек бунтующий» и «человек чувствительный» (М. М. Бахтин и Р. Барт) // Лики времени : сб. статей. — М. : Юстициформ : Филол. фак. МГУ им. М. В. Ломоносова, 2009. С. 8—25.
13. Кузьмина Н. А. Интертекст и его роль в процессах эволюции поэтического языка : моногр. — Екатеринбург : Изд-во Урал. ун-та. — Омск : Омск. ун-т, 1999. 268 с.
14. Кузьмина Н. А. Деидеологизация или новая идеологизация? (Идеологема нового времени) // Язык и стиль современных средств массовой информации : межвуз. сб. науч. тр. Всерос. конф., посвящ. 80-летию проф. Н. С. Валгиной. — М., 2007. С. 192—198.
15. Купина Н. А. Тоталитарный язык: словарь и речевые реакции. — Екатеринбург ; Пермь : Изд-во Урал. ун-та : ЗУУНЦ, 1995. 144 с.
16. Купина Н. А. Языковое строительство: от системы идеологема к системе культурем // Русский язык сегодня. Вып. 1 / РАН. Ин-т рус. яз. им. В. В. Виноградова / отв. ред. Л. П. Крысин. — М. : Азбуковник, 2000. С. 182—189.
17. Купина Н. А. Живые идеологические процессы и проблемы культуры речи // Язык. Система. Личность. — Екатеринбург : Урал. гос. пед. ун-т, 2005. С. 90—104.

18. Мальшева Е. Г. Концепт 'Губернатор' в региональном массово-информационном дискурсе (на материале текстов радиальных и телевизионных СМИ Омской области) // Политическая лингвистика. 2009. Вып. 2 (28). С. 76—86.
19. Мальшева Е. Г. Универсальная идеологема 'Спорт': этнокультурная специфика // Политическая лингвистика. 2010. Вып. 3 (33). С. 163—170.
20. Мирошниченко А. А. Лингво-идеологический анализ языка массовых коммуникаций : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. — Ростов н/Д, 1996. 16с.
21. Новейший философский словарь / А. А. Грицанов, М. А. Можейко, Т. Г. Румянцева, А. И. Мерцалова и др. — М. : Книжный дом, 2003. 1280 с.
22. Новикова Т. Анализ принципов толерантности в текстах СМИ [Электронный ресурс] // RELGA : науч.-культурологич. журн. 2006. № 21 (143). URL: <http://www.relga.ru/Environment/WebObjects/tgu-www.woa/wa/Main?textid=1314&level1=main&level2=articles> (дата обращения: 05.07.2018).
23. Ноженко Е. В. Этнокультурная специфика стереотипов-концептов национального характера: «Уверенность в себе», «Патриотизм», «Успешность» американской лингвокультуры : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. — Кемерово, 2008. 23 с.
24. Одесский М. П., Фельдман Д. М. Идеологема «патриот» в русской, советской и постсоветской культуре // Общественные науки и современность. 2008. № 1. С. 109—123.
25. Ожегов С. И., Шведова Н. Ю. Толковый словарь русского языка. — М. : АЗЪ, 1995. 928 с.
26. Попова З. Д., Стернин И. А. Очерки по когнитивной лингвистике. — Воронеж : Истоки, 2003. 192 с.
27. Радбиль Т. Б. Мифология языка Андрея Платонова : моногр. — М. ; Н. Новгород : Изд-во НГПУ, 1998. 116 с.
28. Сандомирская И. Книга о Родине: опыт анализа дискурсивных практик [Электронный ресурс] // Wiener slawistischer Almanach Linguistische Reihe Herausgegeben Von Tilmann Reuther Sonderband. 50. Wien, 2001. URL: <http://yanko.lib.ru/books/cultur/sadomirskaya-rodina.htm> (дата обращения: 13.07.2009).
29. Торохова М. В. Идеологема «Террор» в ивритоязычной палестинской периодике 1946—1948 гг. : дис. ... канд. филол. наук. — М., 2006. 189 с.
30. Шкайдерова Т. В. Советская идеологическая картина мира: субъекты, время, пространство (на материале заголовков газеты «Правда» 30—40-х гг.) : дис. ... канд. филол. наук. — Омск, 2007. 237 с.
31. Шестов Н. И. Политический миф теперь и прежде / под ред. А. И. Демидова. — Москва : ОЛМА-ПРЕСС, 2005. 412 с.
32. Чудинов А. П. Политическая лингвистика : учеб. пособие. — М. : Флинта : Наука, 2007. 254 с.
33. Эпштейн М. Н. Идеология и язык // Вопросы языкознания. 1991. № 6. С. 19—33.
34. Юнг К.-Г. Об отношении аналитической психологии к поэтико-художественному творчеству // Зарубежная эстетика и теория литературы XIX—XX вв. : трактаты, статьи, эссе. — М. : Изд-во Москов. ун-та, 1987. С. 228—232.