

УДК 821.111“27

DOI: 10.18523/lcmp2522-9281.2021.7.5-21

Olena Moiseyenko

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6262-9678>

Dmytro Mazin

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1487-269X>

FRAMING KYIVAN RUS' IN MODERN AMERICAN MEDIA

The article focuses on identifying and structuring the linguistic frames which are activated in relation to the representation of Kyivan Rus' in the U.S. English media discourse. The research aimed to examine the connections between the first historically recorded East Slavonic state and present-day Ukraine. The linguistic analysis is based on the rhetorical version of framing analysis, seeking to explore the ways how the rhetorical means used by the media contribute to shaping the audience's perceptions in specific historical and political areas.

Keywords: Kyivan Rus', framing analysis, discourse, context, media narrative.

Introduction

The presentation of the past in media discourse is argued to act as a means of constructing frames of the collective memory, the structured experiences of the past shared with other members of the group. In cognitive linguistics, a frame is defined as “a knowledge structure, which is represented at the conceptual level and held in long-term memory, and which relates elements and

entities associated with a particular culturally embedded situation from human experience” (Evans, 2007). The construction of memory includes not only a certain set of historical events and characters to remember, but also a scope of meanings and values according to which these events are defined. A. Hoskins points out that “in late modernity, the collective is forged, or at least mediated, at a global level, if not a global “community”, since the electronic connectivity is paramount in this era” (Hoskins, 2001). Language plays a pivotal role in media framing.

The aim of this research is to examine the language used to represent Kyivan Rus’ and to frame the historic connections between the first historically recorded East Slavonic state and present-day Ukraine in the Internet-publications of today’s American media leaders in online news and information.

Theoretical background

The research of the language aspects of framing of the past in modern media narratives allows for an investigation into cognitive mechanisms actualizing the connections between collective memory and history. The representation of the historical past of a country in world media which frame the perception of a country’s history by the international audience has also the foremost socio-political importance in the context of Ukraine. The history of a country is among the essential components of the conceptual model of nation-brand construct, where the brand is the country, state or nation in question. The nation-brand is defined as “the unique, multi-dimensional blend of elements that provide the nation with culturally grounded differentiation and relevance for all of its target audiences” (Dinnie, 2007, p. 15). The key elements of branding theory are brand identity and brand image: “Identity refers to what something truly is, its essence, whereas image refers to how something is perceived. Evidently, there is frequently a gap between these two states. The identity–image gap tends to be a negative factor, with many nations struggling with the frustration of not being perceived by the rest of the world for what they truly are” (Dinnie, 2007, p. 42).

For Ukraine nation branding for global audience is of significant importance in the context of the Russian hybrid aggression which has been raging since 2014. A. Jacobs stresses that “unlike most forms of conventional warfare, hybrid warfare is not limited to the physical battlefield. Hybrid actors seize every opportunity to use both traditional and modern media so as to develop narratives based on their interests, means and aims. The main intention

in the strategy for political subversion is to isolate and weaken an opponent by eroding his legitimacy in multiple fields” (Jacobs, 2015, p. 3).

The recent study of the ways European media in 2018–2019 covered key events of the 20th century that have an impact on Ukraine’s role in global processes illustrates that there is an issue of perceiving Ukraine as an entity with a clearly defined political and cultural identity (Barbiera, & Perehinets, 2020). The media representations of other stages of the history of Ukraine are also important. To erode the legitimacy of Ukraine, one of the narratives used is a historical narrative on Kyivan Rus’ (Moiseyenko, & Mazin, 2021). The state of Kyivan Rus’ emerged as a powerful nation in the 9th century and disintegrated in the 12th century. The heritage of Kyivan Rus’ is at the conceptual roots of Ukraine’s state identity and the international recognition of its historic legacy. Hence, considering the Russian disinformation narrative directed towards the historic delegitimization of Ukraine, the question arises about the image of the historical identity of Ukraine in world media narratives about Kyivan Rus’, and in the American media, in particular.

O. Palii, a well known Ukrainian historian, points out that the outskirts of Kyivan state, where the Russian and Belarussian peoples later arose, were not called Rus’ – neither when they were under Kyiv’s rule until the 12th century, nor several centuries later (Palii, 2018, p. 122). S. Plokyh, a prominent historian from Harvard University, argues that the identities of the modern-day East Slavonic nations lead back to Kyiv, which gives Ukrainians an advantage: “they can search for their origins without ever leaving their capital” (Plokyh, 2017, p. 33).

The role of historians is crucial in discovering and disseminating the historical facts. But media have an important part in what will be covered, how frames will be constructed, and in which reception contexts they will be interpreted. This research is a first attempt to examine how the connections between the first historically recorded East Slavonic state, Kyivan Rus’, and present-day Ukraine are communicated in the American media.

Methods

To determine how the historic connections between the first historically recorded East Slavonic state, Kyivan Rus’, and its inheritor present-day Ukraine are communicated through the Internet-discourses of today’s American media, a rhetorical version of framing analysis served as a research tool. Researchers operating within a framing perspective are looking for cues of how language choices made by the media push our thinking in specific direc-

tions, in particular, researchers are searching for various framing devices that may have been used: key words, tropes, and concepts (Kuypers, 2009). T. Gitlin in his book “The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the making and unmaking of the new Left” (1980), defines media framing as follows: “Frames are principles of selection, emphasis, and presentation composed of little tacit theories about what exists, what happens, and what matters. Media frames, largely unspoken and unacknowledged, organize the world both for journalists who report it and, in some important degree, for us who rely on their reports. Media frames are persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation, and presentation, of selection, emphasis, and exclusion, by which symbol-handlers routinely organize discourse, whether verbal or visual...” (Gitlin, 1980, pp. 6–7).

The data for this research includes the texts which are posted on the digital platforms of such leaders in online news and information as CNN, the Washington Post, the New York Times, Fox News, the Chicago Tribune, the USA Today, and the Forbes. The corpus consists of the articles published between January 2014 and June 2021.

To identify the articles, which contain the historical term *Kyivan Rus'*, the key word search was used for different terms which are used to name the first East Slavonic state in English, such as *Rus'* and *Kyivan Rus'*. In the Cyrillic alphabet, *Rus'* is spelled ‘*Русь*’: the last character is a soft sign indicating palatalized pronunciation of the preceding consonant, that is why *Rus'* with an apostrophe is a strict transliteration of the name ‘*Русь*’ from the Cyrillic alphabet to the Latin. The term *Rus'* can be modified by the attribute *Kyivan*, which is the transliteration of the Ukrainian adjective formed from the capital’s name *Kyiv*. It should be pointed out that the name of the capital itself always had the Ukrainian spelling *Kyiv* in historic chronicles. The name transliterated from Russian – *Kievan Rus* – was also searched for.

In total, 32 media publications were identified with an explicit reference to *Kyivan Rus'*. The results of the search show that the name transliterated from Russian *Kievan Rus'* is the only spelling used in the American media discourse, as well as the spelling *Kiev* is predominantly used to refer to the present-day capital of Ukraine. The spelling *Kyiv*, which is the official Ukrainian transliterated name, was found in one publication only:

*Putin also points to roots between Ukraine and Russia that date back to the ninth century, when a collection of tribes founded **Kievan Rus** around modern-day **Kyiv*** (The Washington Post, 24/05/2021).

As it can be seen, two ways of transliteration – Kiev(an) and Kyiv – are used side-by-side in the same sentence, which can be perceived as references to two different cities.

Results and discussion

Four major contexts were determined in which the historical name Kyivan Rus' was used in the American media: (1) History of Kyivan Rus' and Ukraine-Russia relations including the sub-context 'Historical figures of Kyivan Rus' and Ukraine-Russia relations', (2) History of the USA, (3) Heroization of the historical figures of Kyivan Rus', and (4) Ukraine as a tourist attraction. Regarding the frequency ratio of the contextual usage, most references to Kyivan Rus' can be met in relation to current events within Ukraine-Russia relations and aggressive activities of the Russian Federation against Ukraine (26 narratives), with 2 narratives per the other three contexts each. Such proportion definitely corresponds to the communicative nature of media to primarily highlight the outstanding and recent events.

History of Kyivan Rus' and Ukraine-Russia relations

The authors of the narratives on the Ukraine-Russia relations are professional journalists, experts, or politicians who specialize in Eastern Europe and international relations. Thus, one of the latest analyzed narrative in this area was posted by Henry Kissinger, a famous American politician, on the platform of Washington Post (The Washington Post, 06/03/2014).

Kyivan Rus' is defined through four different meanings in the analyzed narratives, which target to activate the historical memory as viewed by the authors in connection with the contemporary state of Ukraine-Russia relations:

- a medieval East Slavic state centered on Kyiv
...*Ukraine first belonged to Kievan Rus, a medieval Eastern Slavic state centered on Kiev...* (Forbes, 23/02/2016).

We use the definition of a state as a nation or territory considered as an organized political community under one single government (Online Oxford English dictionary).

Kyivan Rus' is being described as a powerful medieval state with a very large territory in Eastern Europe:

In the 10th century, Kiev was the capital of a thriving state known as Kievan Rus' that ruled a vast territory in Eastern Europe (The Washington Post, 31/10/2018).

- federated territory surrounding ancient Kyiv:
...Kievan Rus – then federated territory surrounding Kiev, now the capital of Ukraine... (CNN, 30/05/2017).
 ‘Federated’ (of a country or organization) here means “a single centralized unit within which each state or division keeps some internal autonomy” (Online Oxford English dictionary).
- a collection of tribes around ancient-day Kyiv:
...Putin also points to roots between Ukraine and Russia that date back to the ninth century, when a collection of tribes founded Kievan Rus around modern-day Kyiv... (The Washington Post, 17/04/2021).
- an ancient empire:
...both countries consider the ancient empire of Kievan Rus (and its capital, Kiev... (The Washington Post, 12/10/2015).

Historical figures of Kyivan Rus’ and Ukraine-Russia relations

In the context of Ukraine-Russia relations, three historical figures are significant in the media historical narratives: *Anna Yaroslavna*, who was a Kyivan Rus’ princess (a daughter of the Kyivan king Yaroslav the Wise) and became **Queen of France** in 1051 upon marrying King Henry I, *Kyiv’s Prince Volodymyr*, who adopted Christianity in 988 as the official religion of Kyivan Rus’, and *Volodymyr Monomach*, who ruled Kyivan Rus’ from 1113 to 1125.

The name of *Anna Yaroslavna* was mentioned during the visit of V. Putin to France in 2017. Russian President Putin referred to the French queen as “Russian Anne” during a news conference with French President E. Macron. Putin’s remark was seen as an attempt to blur the line between Russian and Ukrainian history, and the apparent effort to appropriate a historical figure. The narrative “Twitter d’oh-plomacy: Ukraine mocks Russia with Simpsons GIF” talks about the dispute between Ukraine and Russia on the platform of Twitter stemmed from the comments made by Russian President:

...The countries were sparring over the historical origins of Anna Yaroslavna, an 11th-century figure born in Kievan Rus – then federated territory surrounding Kiev, now the capital of Ukraine – and who went on to become queen of France (CNN, 30/05/2017)

It is interesting that the article uses the modern-coined term *Twitter d’oh-plomacy*, which is understood as the **use of social media by heads of states and their diplomats to conduct diplomatic outreach and public diplomacy.**

In the context of Ukraine-Russia dispute, the author of the narrative introduces the occasional word *d'oh-plomacy* which is formed by blending of *d'oh* (used to express sudden recognition of a foolish blunder or an ironic turn of events) and the part of the word *diplomacy – plomacy*. Within this modality, the argumentation of Ukraine was supported with a GIF-animation related to the famous Simpsons cartoons. Thus, the narrative “Twitter d’oh-plomacy: Ukraine mocks Russia with Simpsons GIF” is an example of multimodal discourse in which several semiotic modes interact to create meaning. The snapshots of Twitter messages are integrated in the narrative.

Prince Volodymyr is defined as *Grand Prince, the Kyivan Rus’ ruler and the legendary saint* in the narratives on different platforms:

*In 988, **Kiev’s Grand Prince Vladimir** adopted Orthodoxy for his subjects* (The Washington Post, 31/10/2018).

*The city was founded by Greek colonists about 2,500 years ago, and later became part of the Byzantine Empire. **The Kievan Rus ruler, Prince Vladimir**, was baptized there in 988 before bringing Christianity to the region* (Fox News, 01/08/2015).

or

*Prince Vladimir was **the legendary saint** who converted Kievan Rus (from which Russia later emerged) to Christianity in the 9th Century* (Fox News, 13/07/2016).

F. Kagan, in his narrative “What’s in a name? Putin’s ominous vision” for Russia critically, analyzes the Russian tradition of giving the names of historical figures to military objects and considers the conceptual basis of giving the names of the Kyivan rulers to submarines in the Russian Federation. Holding a chair position at the American Enterprise Institute supervising Critical Threats Projects, F. Kagan uses nationalism as the key concept of his text. In this article the concept of nationalism is modified as *Putin’s aggressive nationalism*. According to Kagan F., Putin sees the historical figures of St. George the Victor, Dmitrii Donskoi, Yurii Dolgorukii, and Aleksandr Nevskii as gatherers of the Russian lands:

...The bad news is that he is selectively reaching back into Russian history to glorify the “gatherers of the Russian lands,” as they are known, and the Russifiers – those who imposed Russian identity by force on the diverse subjects of the empire...

Putin’s aggressive nationalism is nowhere more obvious than in the new names he has bestowed on many of Russia’s ballistic missile submarines.

These include the St. George the Victor, the Dmitrii Donskoi, the Yurii Dolgorukii, and the Aleksandr Nevskii... (Fox News, 13/07/2016).

It can be noticed that this article, and typically other narratives as well, has a particular focus on the Kyivan rulers, *Prince Volodymyr* and *Volodymyr Monomach*. Frederick W. Kagan proposes two reasons why the names of particularly these Kyivan rulers are used:

- these historical figures share President Putin's first name (Volodymyr):

Two more submarines honor historical figures who happen to share Putin's first name: the Vladimir Monomach and the Prince Vladimir; the latter a 24,000-ton, 16-missile boomer whose keel was laid in July, 2012, shortly after Putin's resumption of Russia's presidency for a third term.

Prince Vladimir was the legendary saint who converted Kievan Rus (from which Russia later emerged) to Christianity in the 9th Century. Vladimir Monomach, on the other hand, was a less noteworthy historical figure descended from, and named for, a Byzantine emperor.

It could also, of course, simply be fortuitous that Prince Vladimir and Vladimir Monomach were the only two Russian rulers of significance who shared Putin's given name (Fox News, 13/07/2016).

- these figures have special historical parallels:

Vladimir the Great conquered those lands with an army from northern Russia; Vladimir Monomakh entered them at the invitation of its population following a rebellion. Putin surely did not miss these obvious historical parallels... (Fox News, 13/07/2016).

The author provides the historical parallels revealing the desire of President of the Russian Federation to conquer modern Ukraine, as implied in the submarines' names.

F. Kagan starts a dialogue with the readers using a combination of the words 'heart' and 'heartland':

*Could it also be a coincidence, then, that both ruled from Kiev, the **heart** of the lands of the Rus, as the forebears of the Russians were known – a **heartland** that includes much of the modern Ukraine?*

Thus, the author is building a semantic chain: *Kiev, the **heart** of the lands of the Rus – a **heartland** that includes much of the modern Ukraine*. However, the fallacy of his chain is in the assumption that the Kyivan Rus' rulers are the forebears of Russians only ...*both ruled from Kiev, the **heart** of the lands of the Rus, as the forebears of the Russians were known...*

Although the author of the narrative presents modern Ukraine as the heartland of Kyivan Rus', the act of excluding Ukrainians as descendants of the Kyivan Rus' rulers leads to the framing *Kyivan Rus' – modern Russia*. A logical fallacy of composition can be noticed above when one infers that something is true of the whole basing exclusively on the fact that it is true of only a part of the whole can be explained by the insufficient knowledge of the history of Eastern Slavonic region. The quoted text does not take into account the fact that "in *Moscovia* itself, the term *Russia* is first used in reference to that country by the authorities as late as in the 15th century when the idea of seizing Ukraine's lands began to circulate there" (Palii, 2018, p. 124).

In the context of Ukraine-Russia relations, the connections between the first historically recorded Eastern Slavonic state, Kyivan Rus', and contemporaneity are communicated in different ways. For instance, the frame *Kyivan Rus' – modern Russia* is constructed with parallel structures and the key word *now*:

My contention is that a look at the broader sweep of Russian history (already when what we now know as Russia was known as the Kievan Rus')... (Forbes, 01/09/2014).

The elements which contribute to the frame *Kyivan Rus' – modern Russia* can include the names of the capitals: Kyiv as the capital of Kyivan Rus' and Moscow as the capital of modern Russia:

*In the 10th century, Kiev was the capital of a thriving state known as **Kievan Rus'** that ruled a vast territory in Eastern Europe. In 988, Kiev's Grand Prince Vladimir adopted Orthodoxy for his subjects. Kiev was the center of Christianity in the Eastern Slavic world until it was conquered by Mongol invaders in 1241. Eventually, the seat of the church would relocate to **Moscow** while Constantinople would fall to the Ottomans in 1453, giving rise to the aura of **Moscow** as the "Third Rome" (The Washington Post, 31/10/2018).*

The spokespersons in the narratives for framing *Kyivan Rus' – modern Russia* can be the following:

- Russians who emphasize their historical connections with the Ukrainian land; in other words, who have their home on the Ukrainian lands:

*Many people in eastern Ukraine are ethnically Russian and speak the Russian language. **Many Russians also hail their own historical links to Ukrainian land and the Kievan Rus, an East Slavic state that peaked in the 11th century and was***

centered upon what is now the Ukrainian capital (The Washington Post, 19/07/2017).

- Russia supporters, who angrily insist on common ancestors and one culture with Ukraine

Mostly, it was well received, but I got a fair number of angry comments from Russia supporters. Some said that I didn't understand anything about Ukraine, pointing to the fact that Russia and Ukraine share common ancestors – the Kievan Rus, ancient slavic tribes that founded both Kiev and Moscow in the 9th-12th centuries – and are therefore one culture (Forbes, 13/07/2014).

- President of the Russian Federation, V. Putin:

As Putin made a point of saying in his speech, the Crimea is the place from which Russia took its Christianity. According to medieval chronicles, it was in Chersonesus, the ancient Greek colonial city on the southwestern coast of the Crimea, just outside Sevastopol, that another Vladimir, the Grand Prince of Kiev, was baptized in 988, thereby bringing Christianity to Kievan Rus', the loose confederation of Slavic principalities from which Russia derives its religious and national identity (Chicago Tribune, 21/03/2014).

In his narrative on the platform of Washington Post, H. Kissinger, a famous American politician, even imposes the frame *Kievan Rus' – modern Russia* on, as he writes, *the West*. *The West* is used here as a metonymy meaning both *Europe and North America seen in contrast to other civilizations* (Online Oxford English Dictionary). In particular, Kissinger H.A. uses the modal verb *must*:

...The West must understand that, to Russia, Ukraine can never be just a foreign country. Russian history began in what was called Kievan-Rus. The Russian religion spread from there... (The Washington Post, 06/03/2014).

At the same time, a narrative exists where a citation of V. Putin is undermined with a reference to Ukrainian nationalists, although no names are provided, and a reference to scholar A. Wilson, who argues that the historiography of Rus' is fraught with the question of contested national origins. As the result, the narration on Kyivan Rus' is a combination of several references where the main cohesive means is a repetition of Rus' but the frame is perceived as unclear since the conclusion is not explicated:

...Putin said, "Crimea is primordial "Russkaya" land, and Sevastapol is a "Russkii" city." He went on to say, "Kiev is the mother of "Russkie" cities," in a reference to the ancient city of Kievan Rus'. (This reference must have grated on

the ears of Ukrainian nationalists; as scholar Andrew Wilson points out, the historiography of Rus' is fraught with the question of contested national origins.)... (The Washington Post, 19/03/2014).

There is only one example of narrative where the frame *Kyivan Rus'* – *present-day states* includes three states – Russia, Belarus and Ukraine, and it is structured through an adjective *modern-day*:

*Ukraine first belonged to **Kyivan Rus**, a medieval Eastern Slavic state centered on Kiev that encompassed **modern-day Russia, Belarus and Ukraine**. But the kingdom began to decline, eventually falling to the Mongols in the 13th century, and the center of Eastern Slavic power shifted to Moscow. Kiev, and the territory that today makes up Ukraine, languished (Forbes, 23/02/2016).*

It is curious that the symbolic metaphor *Mother Russia* plays an important role in the narratives written by American journalists in the context of Ukraine-Russia relations. On the one hand, O. Riabov argues that “Mother Russia” has been one of the most important symbols of the Russian history for many centuries – and it has clearly become an element of the myth-symbol complex of the Russian culture (Riabov, 2020).

On the other hand, the authors of the analyzed narratives view the entire history of East Slavonic region as the history of Russia only; for them Russia is the Mother for all East Slavonic nations. The rebirth of Ukraine as an independent state has caused a serious cognitive dissonance in their traditional beliefs. Thus, J. McLaughlin narrates about the pain which *Mother Russia* feels because of the split. Yet, the question is how Russia can be defined as *Mother* in the context of *Kyivan Rus'* if *Kyivan Rus'* is defined by the author as *the forerunner* of Russia:

*While East European countries shared no cultural heritage with the Soviet Union, Ukraine, is seen (fairly or not) by many Russians as part of the motherland—making the split a more painful one for **Mother Russia** to conceive of. (Kiev, after all, was the 9th century capitol of the first East Slavic state, **Kyivan Rus**, **the forerunner of modern Russia** (USA Today, 25/02/2014).*

The cognitive dissonance which is revealed through the use of the contradictory notions can be explained by the gaps in the historical knowledge. As it was mentioned earlier, in *Moscovia*, the use of the term *Russia* began in reference to that country by the authorities only in the 15th century (which is 3 centuries after *Kyivan Rus'*).

In the next example, it is stated that *Mother Russia* was born in Ukraine which logically means that Ukraine is the mother to *Mother Russia*:

*Russia's policies reflect this underlying truth. Ukraine's economy is not only deeply intertwined with Russia's – Ukraine is a key consumer and primary conduit through which Russian gas flows to Western Europe – but it also has a totemic importance in the psychology of Russians. Slavic civilization and the Russian Orthodox Church started with the Kievan Rus. **Mother Russia was born in Ukraine** (The Washington Post, 25/11/2019).*

So, the analysis of the tropes used in the narratives in the American media emphasizes the importance of the knowledge of history, especially when dealing with the topic of long-lasting relations between countries. Assumed gaps in the historical knowledge may entail striking inconsistencies and confusion to a critical reader, which can also be revealed through frame analysis. The repeated usage of the lexemes 'Russia', 'Russians', repeated quotations of Russia's president contribute to framing 'Kyivan Rus' – Russia'.

The context of the history of the USA

Few cases can be found with direct or implied references between the concept of Kyivan Rus' and the U.S. history. Certainly, historically it may be explained by the differences and duration in the historical periods the two countries went through and the lack of direct relationship with the Ukrainian medieval state. Still, some attempts at building parallels between the historical periods of the two countries can be found in U.S. media publications. Thus, in the article "A Patriot's Almanac" by Ch. Stirewalt, in the context of the U.S. history, Kyivan Rus' is regarded as an origin tale, or a 'birth story' for Russians:

*From such small things, many great things descend. A nation is no different. For the British its **King Arthur** and Camelot. For Italy it's **Romulus** and **Remus**. **For the Russians it is Kievan Rus**. And, like any couple, there are varying degrees of accuracy in those **origin tales**.*

Americans are lucky in many ways, not the least of which is that our own story of becoming is pretty close to the real thing (Fox News, 03/07/2019).

As it can be seen, the Kyivan Rus's history is viewed by the American author in this particular publication as part of some mythological or legendary discourse, not a historical fact.

The context of heroization of the historical figures of Kyivan Rus'

The story of the life of the historical figure of the medieval *Princess Olga of Kyivan Rus'* is depicted in the review of McRobbie's book, "Princesses Behaving Badly: Real Stories From History – Without the Fairy-Tale Endings" (2013) presented on the platform of *Chicago Tribune*. McRobbie explores the backstories of famous ladies of royal lines.

The review offers the frame *Kyivan Rus' – now known as Ukraine*. The important elements of the frame are the key words *research at the British library* which support the validity of the offered frame:

*And we learn more about Princess Olga of **Kievan Rus (now known as Ukraine)**, as well. McRobbie's **research at the British Library** revealed that enemies killed her husband, Igor, and she took revenge on them by burying them alive, burning them in a bathhouse and killing them via birds who'd had their feet tied with cloths dipped in sulfur, thus torching the owners' houses when the birds flew home (Chicago Tribune, 17/05/2018).*

The context of Ukraine as a tourist attraction

In the narrative *Ukraine: 11 best places to visit* on the platform of CNN, *Kyivan Rus'* is represented in the description of architecture of the modern Ukrainian city Chernihiv. Chernihiv is among other 10 Ukrainian cities such as Lviv, Chernivtsi, Uman, Kyiv, Mukacheve, Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi, Kharkiv, Chernihiv, Odessa, Uzhhorod, and Kamianets-Podilskyi, which are depicted as tourist attractions. The description of Chernihiv's architecture of the historical period of *Kyivan Rus'* is part of the discourse of geographical *Realms of Memory (A lieu de mémoire)*, defined as any significant entity, whether material or non-material in nature, which has become a symbolic element of the memorial heritage of any community (Nora, 1996).

Chernihiv is home to a third of all the eastern European historic landmarks of the period of *Kyivan Rus'*. The specific features of the narrative about the architecture of *Kyivan Rus'* are the special terms such as *ecclesiastical* (relating to the Christian Church) and *the Transfiguration* (Christ's appearance in radiant glory to three of his disciples) which add sophistication to the narrative:

*Chernihiv is one of the oldest cities in Ukraine, and was once a prospering and important center of medieval **Kievan Rus**, the first East Slavic state. There are unique examples of medieval Slavic ecclesiastical architecture, and one of the*

oldest churches in Ukraine – the Transfiguration Cathedral, which was completed in the 11th century and features stunning frescoes and ancient interiors.

Chernihiv is home to a third of all the eastern European historic landmarks period before the Mongol invasion (CNN, 24/08/2018).

The *Realms of Memory* create a valid argument for framing modern Ukraine as the inheritor of Kyivan Rus’.

Conclusion

The use of the historical term *Kyivan Rus’*, including the variations of its spelling (*Kyivan Rus’* as based on the Ukrainian spelling and *Kievan Rus’* as transliterated from the Russian language) in the explored media is closely related to the historical and ideological strategies, focused around the treatment of Ukrainian nationhood and independence. This term is used for constructing discursive frames through activating rhetorical tools in public texts. The historical term *Kyivan Rus’* should be considered as an explicit linguistic marker representing attitudes towards Ukrainian historical legacy as revealed in the comparative analysis of its usage in Ukrainian and American media discourses.

The study of framing of the first historically recorded East Slavonic state, Kyivan Rus’, in the American media narratives shows the topical status of Kyivan Rus’ representation in relation to current political and public events. In particular, the authors of the reviewed narratives search for heroes in the history of Kyivan Rus’ to be applicable for their today’s audience, and they also search for answers to modern geopolitical issues in the context of Ukraine – Russia relations. The name of the medieval state is integrated into modern discourse: it is used in the combination with modern lexemes in the different contexts. Yet, the analysis of the definitions of Kyivan Rus’ provided in the narratives which include the definitions of Kyivan Rus’ as a state, an empire, a collection of tribes or even an ancient tale, may point to the insufficiency of knowledge about the history of Kyivan Rus’ among the media writers. The gaps in the historical knowledge are also revealed when the media authors are trying to frame the historic connections between the first historically recorded East Slavonic state and present-day Ukraine. The majority of the authors of narratives view the history of nations of East Slavonic region as the history of Russia only: their view of the history is represented through the use of metaphor *Mother Russia* and through the reiteration of such lexemes as *Russia*, *Russian* and *Russians*, and the absence of the word *Ukrainians*, people of Ukrainian descent, in their narratives. The rebirth of Ukraine as an indepen-

dent state causes a cognitive dissonance for the journalists since the today's geopolitical reality does not correlate with their beliefs about the history of East Slavonic region. The cognitive dissonance is revealed in the logical fallacies and contradictory notions in framing the historic connections between the first historically recorded East Slavonic state and modern states. At the same time, the narratives based on the research and *Realms of Memory* provide a valid framing *Kyivan Rus' – now known as Ukraine* in the American media.

The study shows that the world audience is offered a spectrum of frames to perceive the history of Ukraine. The determined features of framing of the first historically recorded East Slavonic state, *Kyivan Rus'*, and its links to present-day Ukraine produce an uncertain image of the historical identity of Ukraine for the world audience in today's American media. To address insufficient knowledge of the history of East Slavonic region, the Ukrainian state should be more active in presenting the historic facts to the world audience.

References

- Barbiera, I., & Perehinets, K. (2020). *Istoriia XX st. v ievropeiskyykh ZMI: Doslidzhennia mediinoho naratyvu shchodo podii, iaki mait' vplyv na rol Ukrainy u svitovykh protsesakh [The History of XX cent. in European mass media: Research into the media narratives having influence on the role of Ukraine in global processes]*. The Ukrainian Institute. Retrieved from ui.org.ua [in Ukrainian].
- Dinnie, K. (2007). *Nation branding: Concepts, Issues, Practice*. Oxfordshire: Taylor & Francis.
- Evans, V. (2007). *A Glossary of Cognitive Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the making and unmaking of the new Left*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Hoskins, A. (2001). New Memory: Mediating history. *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 21 (4), 333–346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01439680120075473>
- Jacobs, A., & Lasconjaras, Gu. (2015). “NATO's Hybrid Flanks: Handling Unconventional warfare on the South and the East”, Research paper, 112/2015, Rome: NATO Defence College. Retrieved from https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/190786/rp_112.pdf.
- Kuypers, J. A. (2009). “Framing Analysis” *How to Conduct a Rhetorical Framing Study of the News*. Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action., MD: Lexington Books, 181–200. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318926032_Framing_Analysis_How_to_Conduct_a_Rhetorical_Framing_Study_of_the_News.
- Moiseyenko, O., & Mazin, D. (2021). Manipulating the image of ‘Kyiv Rus’ in English-language publications of the Russia Today (RT) media resource. *Linguistic and Conceptual Worldviews*. Kyiv (accepted for publication).
- Nora, P. (1996). *Realms of Memory. The Construction of the French Past* (Volume 1. Conflicts and Division). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Palii, O. A. (2018). *Istoriia Ukrainy. Korotkyi kurs [History of Ukraine. A short course]*. Kyiv: Samit-book [in Ukrainian].
- Plokhly, S. (2017). *The Gates of Europe: A History of Ukraine*. New York: Basic Books.
- Riabov, O. (2020). The Symbol of the Motherland in the Legitimation and Delegitimation of Power in Contemporary Russia. *Nationalist Papers*, 752–767.

Олена Моїсеєнко, Дмитро Мазін

ФРЕЙМІНГ КИЇВСЬКОЇ РУСІ У СУЧАСНИХ АМЕРИКАНСЬКИХ МЕДІА

Постановка проблеми. Репрезентація історичного минулого у медіа-дискурсі пов'язана з актуалізацією й вибудовою фреймів колективної пам'яті. Образ Київської Русі є одним із найчастіше вживаних історичних концептів, який активно згадують у контексті відносин між Україною та Росією та російсько-української війни, які висвітлюються також у провідних іноземних ЗМІ. Важливо простежити, яким саме образ середньовічної держави Київська Русь актуалізується в англomовних публікаціях американських інтернет-видань. Виявлення і класифікація сталих фреймових структур у медіадискурсі дасть змогу краще зрозуміти використані риторичні стратегії, спрямовані на формування певної суспільної думки у західного читача стосовно історичного іміджу України як держави.

Мета статті: дослідити мовні засоби, які використовують для репрезентації Київської Русі та створення фреймів щодо історичних зв'язків між першою східнослов'янською державою Київська Русь та сучасною державою Україна в інтернет-нарративах сучасних провідних американських медіа інформаційного спрямування.

Методи дослідження. Для виявлення способів репрезентації історичних зв'язків між середньовічною державою Київська Русь та сучасною державою Україна в американських медіа було застосовано фреймовий аналіз, орієнтований на виявлення риторичних структур. Такий підхід дає змогу виявити закономірності відбору лінгвістичних засобів, зокрема вживаних ключових слів, тропів, концептів, якими медіатексти спонукають читачів до певного сприйняття інформації. Для аналізу було використано віднайдені текстові інтернет-публікації провідних американських медіа (CNN, The Washington Post, The New York Times, Fox News, USA Today та ін.), загалом 32 нарративи, де згадується українська середньовічна держава Київська Русь.

Основні результати дослідження. У результаті проведеного фреймового аналізу виявлено чотири основні контексти вживання історичної назви «Київська Русь» в американських медіа, зокрема «Історія Київської Русі та українсько-російські відносини», який має тематичний підконтекст «Історичні постаті Київської Русі та українсько-російські відносини», «Контекст історії США», «Контекст героїзації історичних постатей Київської Русі» та «Контекст України як туристичного об'єкта». У рамках кожного контексту було проаналізовано мовні й риторичні засоби побудови фреймів.

Висновки і перспективи. Дослідження дає змогу встановити прямий зв'язок між фреймами, які постають в англомовних медіа, та рівнем обізнаності авторів проаналізованих наративів з історичними фактами та процесами в Україні та східнослов'янському регіоні в цілому. В англомовних статтях простежується прямий зв'язок між образом Київської Русі та сучасною державою Україна. Проте брак і прогалини історичних знань, передусім у контексті сучасних українсько-російських відносин, ведуть до довільного тлумачення і навіть спотворення історичних зв'язків між державою Київська Русь та процесами у сучасній державі Україна, а також можуть викликати когнітивний дисонанс у сприйнятті сучасних геополітичних реалій. Перспективним вбачається подальше дослідження на основі ширшого медіаматеріалу репрезентації минулого України інших історичних періодів.

Ключові слова: Київська Русь, фреймовий аналіз, дискурс, контекст, медіанаратив.

Матеріал надійшов 18.08.2021



Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0)