Marta Noińska / Urszula Patocka-Sigłowy / Żanna Sładkiewicz (eds.)

Language – Media – Ideology

V&R unipress

Language – Media – Ideology

Interdisziplinäre Verortungen der Angewandten Linguistik

Herausgegeben von

Sylwia Adamczak-Krysztofowicz
Silvia Bonacchi
Przemysław Gębal
Jarosław Krajka
Łukasz Kumięga
Hadrian Lankiewicz

BAND 32

Die Bände dieser Reihe sind peer-reviewed.

Language – Media – Ideology

Edited by

Marta Noińska
Urszula Patocka-Sigłowy
Żanna Sładkiewicz

V&R unipress

Reviewers: Małgorzata Demiańczuk-Popiało (Akademia Policji w Szczytnie), Arkadiusz Dudziak (Uniwersytet Warmińsko-Mazurski w Olsztynie), Anna Granat (Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej w Lublinie), Daniel Kalinowski (Uniwersytet Pomorski w Słupsku), Aleksander Kiklewicz (Uniwersytet Warmińsko-Mazurski w Olsztynie), Joanna Kozłowska (Uniwersytet Warszawski), Mirosława Michalska-Suchanek (Uniwersytet Śląski w Katowicach), Barbara Rodziewicz (Uniwersytet Szczeciński), Monika Rzeczycka (Uniwersytet Gdański), Danuta Stanulewicz-Skrzypiec (Uniwersytet Gdański)

ISSN 2749-0211
ISSN 2749-022X (DIGITAL)
ISBN 978-3-8471-2051-3
ISBN 978-3-8470-2051-6 (PDF)
ISBN 978-3-7370-2051-0 (ELIBRARY)
DOI https://doi.org/10.14220/9783737020510

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über https://dnb.dnb.de abrufbar.

© 2026 Brill Deutschland GmbH, Robert-Bosch-Breite 10, 37079 Göttingen, Deutschland

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Dieses Werk sowie einzelne Teile desselben sind urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung in anderen als den gesetzlich zugelassenen Fällen ist ohne vorherige schriftliche Zustimmung des Verlags nicht zulässig. Text- und Datamining zu kommerziellen Zwecken bedarf der Genehmigung des Verlags.

V&R unipress und Brill Deutschland GmbH sind Teil von De Gruyter Brill.
www.degruyterbrill.com

Fragen zur allgemeinen Produktsicherheit: productsafety@degruyterbrill.com

Contents

Foreword vii
Marta Noińska, Urszula Patocka-Sigłowy, Żanna Sładkiewicz

PART 1
Ideology in Narrative Language: Memory and Trauma

1 Ideology and Rhetoric in Friedrich Gorenstein's Disputes about Dostoevsky 3
Boris Lanin

2 Authorial Interpretations of Collective Trauma 16
Nino Mindiashvili

PART 2
Media of Empire and Nation: Ideology, Language, Colonial Optics

3 From the Perspective of the Colonizer: Alexander Hilferding's View on the Polish Question 27
Bianca Sadowska

4 Polish Conservatives' Position on the Lithuanian National Movement: The Case of *Kraj* 39
Iwona Sakowicz-Tebinka

PART 3
Language as Ideological Infrastructure: Discourse, Meaning, Semiotic Resources

5 Tradition as a Discursive Resource in University Mission Statements: A Cross-Linguistic Comparison 57
Beata Mikołajczyk and Péter Csatár

6 On the Meaning and Usage of the Noun Samoakceptacja ('Self-Acceptance') 79
Karolina Lisczyk

7 Colour as a Sign in Nature, Culture, Discourses, and Media 96
Iwona Loewe

PART 4

Emotion and Ideology in Persuasive Media Discourse

8 First Social Advertisements of the Post-Soviet Period in Georgian Television Space 125
Soso Gazdeliani and Nino Chalaganidze

9 The Role of Social Advertising in Covering Issues Related to Children: The Case of Georgia (2020–2025) 136
Ekaterina Chalaganidze

10 Does Anything Still Disgust Us? Realizations of Disgust in Media Messages: A Mediolinguistic Perspective 146
Aleksandra Kalisz

PART 5

AI as Medium and Ideological Actor: Language, Hallucinations, Self-Reflection

11 The Human in the Mirror of AI: AI "Hallucinations" as a Tool of Self-Reflection 167
Anastasija Belovodskaja

Foreword

This monograph is the result of a research project situated at the intersection of three fields that have become increasingly entangled in the humanities over recent decades: language, media, and ideology. Rather than treating these as separate domains, we approach them as interdependent dimensions of a single cultural process that encompasses the production of meaning, the organization of collective experience, and the regulation of attitudes in public life. In this view, ideology is understood as a mode in which discourse operates to construct meaning. Media are not neutral channels of transmission but actively shape interpretive frameworks. Language serves as a tool for constructing social reality – from memory narratives and institutional discourse to the digital attention economy and generative AI.

The volume's central aim is to trace how, across different historical periods, genres, and media channels, communities develop mechanisms for interpreting their own experience, drawing boundaries between "us" and "them", legitimizing norms, and harnessing emotion as a persuasive resource. The collected texts chart a trajectory from classical forms of literate culture and literary debate, through the press as an instrument of identity politics, to institutional discourses and semiotic analysis. This trajectory continues into the contemporary digital sphere and finally into the emerging landscape of generative AI.

The first part, *Ideology in Narrative Language: Memory and Trauma*, sets up an interpretive lens in which narrative language and rhetoric become central to understanding ideology as a form of meaning control. Boris Lanin's chapter on Friedrich Gorenstein's play *Disputes about Dostoevsky* (1973) shows how a fictional editorial board meeting gives voice to a polyphony of worldview positions. The dispute over how to read Dostoevsky exposes mechanisms of censorship, peer pressure, antisemitism, and rhetorical manipulation, revealing the ways institutional discourse works to contain a plurality of meanings within a monologic ideological frame. Nino Mindiashvili's contribution, which examines authorial treatments of collective trauma in post-Soviet Georgian literature, shifts attention toward cultural memory. Analyzing a range of narrative strategies, she argues that experiences of armed conflict and socio-economic crisis are processed, symbolized, and negotiated, and the literary text becomes a record of suffering and a means of forging new identities. What ties this section together is the conviction that ideological tensions, whether in institutional settings or in the realm of memory, can be revealed through close attention to language and narrative structure.

The second part, *Media of Empire and Nation: Ideology, Language, Colonial Optics*, explores how the press and public commentary serve as long-term carriers of ideology, reproducing hierarchies, mapping ethnic and national categories, and generating the interpretive frameworks through which communities come to recognize themselves. Bianka Sadowska's study recovers a perspective that has received relatively little attention in Polish cultural memory: views of the Russian publicist and activist Alexander Hilferding on the "Polish question". Her analysis captures the logic of imperial discourse, in which the reality under description is organized according to the colonizer's own political and civilizational categories, exposing the mechanisms by which domination is legitimized. Iwona Sakowicz-Tebinka's study of *Kraj*, a Polish periodical published in Saint Petersburg, introduces the especially resonant theme of "double coloniality". Poles, themselves subject to the pressures of the Russian Empire, were simultaneously accused of colonialism toward Lithuanians. The analysis of press discourse thus uncovers layered configurations of agency and subordination, along with their lasting consequences for historical perception. This section shows that conflicts over identity are, at bottom, conflicts over the language in which the world is described.

The third part, *Language as Ideological Infrastructure: Discourse, Meaning, Semiotic Resources*, shifts focus to the machinery beneath ideology: the discursive and semiotic resources that underpin shared assumptions. Beata Mikołajczyk and Péter Csatár examine how the concept of *tradition* operates in university mission statements as a legitimizing resource (via historicization, normativization, and authorization), with a comparison of German, Polish, and Hungarian material revealing distinct national profiles in how institutions present themselves. Karolina Lisczyk's corpus-based study moves the analysis to the level of value-laden vocabulary in public circulation: *self-acceptance* emerges as a concept tightly clustered around particular themes (body, sexuality, health, relationships) and embedded in specific media ecosystems (celebrity gossip sites and portals aimed at women), which points to the discursive production of norms and expectations. Iwona Loewe's chapter on colour as a sign offers a wide-ranging methodological perspective (textological and multimodal). She demonstrates that colour constitutes a semiotic resource with a stable presence in discursive practices, whose connotations can be contested and renegotiated, particularly on social media. This chapter combines the analysis of language with the analysis of the image, setting up the transition to mass communication in digital environments.

The fourth part, *Emotion and Ideology in Persuasive Media Discourse*, turns to media as technologies for managing emotions. Two chapters on social advertising in Georgia offer a diachronic perspective: from the 1990s, when

television spots were shaped by technological limitations and the stylistic inheritance of the Soviet era (Soso Gazdeliani and Nino Chalaganidze), to 2020–2025, when internationally backed campaigns targeted shifts in social norms around children's rights and violence, with their effectiveness sometimes evaluated through statistical data (Ekaterina Chalaganidze). Aleksandra Kalisz, working within a mediolinguistic framework, traces how disgust is realized across multimodal media messages and how it serves a strategic function by capturing attention, signalling the sender's stance, and enabling both persuasion and stigmatization. This section shows how emotions in the media are managed according to recognizable patterns.

The final part, *AI as Medium and Ideological Actor: Language, Hallucinations, Self-Reflection*, moves the discussion into the most rapidly evolving area of the media ecosystem: the coexistence of content generated by humans and by generative AI. Anastasija Belovodskaja proposes that *AI hallucinations* be understood not as a technical glitch but as a cultural-philosophical phenomenon, one that reveals analogies between distortion mechanisms in language models and representational deformation in human cognition. She draws particular attention to multimodal and cultural hallucinations, which stem from the absence of embodied experience and from biases encoded in training data. In this light, AI is no longer merely a tool but an actor that co-shapes worldviews. The monograph closes with a call to develop philosophical and semiotic frameworks adequate to an era in which meaning is produced in a hybrid environment, and the line between describing the world and creating it through text continues to blur.

Even as carriers and technologies change, from literature and the press to digital media and AI, the fundamental questions endure: who holds interpretive power, what semiotic and emotional resources are available to discourse, and how media amplify or erode the pluralism of meaning. The chapters gathered here also draw on a range of methods, from hermeneutics and comparative analysis through postcolonial studies and institutional discourse analysis to media linguistics and multimodal analysis. What they share, however, is a commitment to describing the mechanisms by which discourse becomes the space where ideology shows its hand.

Marta Noińska, Urszula Patocka-Sigłowy, Żanna Sładkiewicz

PART 1

Ideology in Narrative Language: Memory and Trauma



CHAPTER 1

Ideology and Rhetoric in Friedrich Gorenstein's Disputes about Dostoevsky

Boris Lanin

Abstract This chapter examines Friedrich Gorenstein's play *Disputes about Dostoevsky* (1973), a dramatic exploration of ideological conflict within the Soviet literary establishment. Set during a fictional editorial board meeting, the play stages a debate over a controversial manuscript titled *Dostoevsky's Atheism*. Through a polyphonic structure reminiscent of Mikhail Bakhtin's theories, Gorenstein presents a spectrum of ideological positions – liberal-Westernist, nationalist, and Stalinist – each vying to define Dostoevsky's legacy. The play reveals how literary interpretation becomes a proxy for broader political, ethnic, and philosophical tensions in late Soviet society. Anti-Semitism, editorial censorship, and rhetorical manipulation are central themes, exposing the fragility of intellectual freedom under ideological control. Gorenstein's work ultimately critiques the monologic nature of Soviet discourse and affirms the necessity of dialogic plurality in literary and cultural analysis.

Keywords Gorenstein – Dostoevsky – rhetoric – ideology – polyphony – anti-Semitism – Bakhtin – polyphony – censorship – literary criticism

Fyodor Dostoevsky occupied a special place in Friedrich Gorenstein's reflections, prose, and dramaturgy[1]. Contemporary researcher Olga Chudova writes:

> Gorenstein engaged in dialogue with the author of the great Pentateuch not only in his journalistic articles (*Ideological Problems of Berlin City Toilets*, *The Sixth End of the Red Star*), literary-critical works (*Chekhov and the Thinking Proletarian*), but also in works of fiction (*Psalm*, *Redemption*, *The Place*, *Disputes about Dostoevsky*, *Steps*, etc.). (Chudova 2008: 137)

Boris Lanin, ORCID 0000-0001-5542-7616; Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań.

1 This research was funded in whole or in part by Narodowe Centrum Nauki Reg. nr 2022/47/B/HS2/01244. For the purpose of Open Access, the author has applied a CC-BY public copyright license to any Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) version arising from this submission.

© 2026 BRILL DEUTSCHLAND GMBH | HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.14220/9783737020510.3

In 1973, Friedrich Gorenstein wrote the play *Disputes about Dostoevsky* in Moscow, which was first published fifteen years later, in 1988, in New York by the publishing house "Slovo/Word" as part of the collection *Three Plays*. In 1990, this work became Gorenstein's first publication, marking his return to the literary scene of the mother country. The two-act play builds up the figure of Fyodor Dostoevsky as a symbolic and intellectual center. Although he is not presented as a character, Dostoevsky's ideas, texts, and interpretations form the discursive field of conflict and personal revelations of the characters.

The play's plot is deceptively simple. At a meeting of the editorial board of a state publishing house, a manuscript entitled *Dostoevsky's Atheism* by Roman Grigorievich Edemsky is under discussion. The editorial board must decide whether to publish or reject the work. Although a contract has already been signed and an advance paid, the final decision hinges on the ideological acceptability of Edemsky's interpretation. The debate dramatizes the full spectrum of Soviet literary approaches to Dostoevsky, mirroring the intellectual and political fractures of the time.

Gorenstein composed the play during the deep crisis of official Marxism–Leninism, following the collapse of Khrushchev's utopian promises of accelerated communism. As Gennady Kostyrchenko (2013) observes:

> The ideological vacuum was rapidly filled with a diverse array of oppositional and politicized ideas. Long latent within the intellectual sphere, this ideational current began to assert itself with increasing boldness and volume in response to the regime's softening – particularly within the literary milieu, where it differentiated into three distinct directions: liberal-Westernist, Russian-native soil (pochvennicheskaya), and conservative-Stalinist. (Kostyrchenko 2013: 120)

The author of the monograph, Edemsky, speaks several times with conviction and emotional energy, mentioning thinkers, writers, and literary scholars who were banned in the USSR, which arouses the suspicion of the publishing house's editor-in-chief, Pavel Vartanyants, and his deputy, Mikhail Soskis.

Edemsky and his friend Zhuovyan, who came to support him, belong to the liberal-Western camp. Chernokotov and his supporters represent the Russian-nationalist camp. The publishing house's management, especially Vartanyants and Soskis, on whom the editorial board's decisions depend most, are very conservative in their views and actions. Their rhetoric is full of bureaucratic jargon and contains many ideological clichés of official Soviet literary criticism.

The very title *Dostoevsky's Atheism: Spiritual Searches, or Scientific Psychoanalysis* provokes anxiety. Vartanyants warns that such an interpretation risk

undermining Dostoevsky's official image and thus threatens the ideological function of his canonization. However, Fyodor Dostoevsky himself touched on this topic. Prince Myshkin exclaimed:

> It is so easy for a Russian to become an atheist, easier than for anyone else in the world! And ours do not simply become atheists, but inevitably believe in atheism as if it were a new faith, without noticing that they have believed in nothing. (Dostoevsky 1973: 452)

The play stages not only a debate over a manuscript but also a struggle over the symbolic ownership of Dostoevsky himself. Rather than centering on the progression of external events, the play foregrounds a collision of divergent interpretations of Dostoevsky's oeuvre, intricately linked to the behavioral dynamics of its interlocutors. It constitutes an intellectual "drama of ideas", wherein the literary debate surrounding Dostoevsky's legacy is refracted through an additional lens – namely, that of socio-ethnic identity.

The time frame corresponds to the heyday of the so-called "Russian Party" – an informal association supported by part of the Soviet party elite and including representatives of the creative and publishing spheres, including writers, artists, and editors of leading magazines. Nikolai Mitrokhin wrote:

> In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the "Russian Party" entered a phase of organizational consolidation as an independent political and social force: decision-making centers emerged, along with leaders ("chiefs") and even "rank-and-file fighters of the Russian Party" <…> Within the "Russian Party", there existed a genuine polyphony of views. Individuals who shared the party's two core tenets – "love for Russia (Russians)" and the "correct stance on the main issue" (hatred of Jews) – demonstrated a remarkable diversity of opinions on other political, social, aesthetic, and even religious matters. (Mitrokhin 2005: 378–379)

In his chamber play, featuring a small cast of characters, Gorenstein succeeded in conveying not only the extremist disposition of the party's rank-and-file, but also the diversity of their tactics and ideological positions.

The drama also exposes fault lines of national and ethnic identity in Soviet cultural discourse. The publishing house leadership is composed of national minorities – Vartanyants, an Armenian, and Soskis, a Jew. During the debate, nationalist participants repeatedly question their legitimacy in representing "the Russian genius". These remarks come from Vasily Chernokotov, an aggressive unemployed alcoholic who constantly carries Dostoevsky's works with him and demonstratively refers to them. Chernokotov also tried to write a

work about Dostoevsky, but not only he suffered for his article *Sonya Marmeladova – Venus of St. Petersburg*, but also his teacher Soskis.

It is in the character of Chernokotov that anti-Semitism manifests itself in the play. His lines combine personal bitterness, xenophobia, and persistent everyday anti-Semitic stereotypes. Anti-Semitism in *Disputes about Dostoevsky* is present not only as part of ideological polemics, but also as a tool for revealing the characters' personalities and their hidden motives. The discussion about Dostoevsky gradually escalates into a conflict of a national nature, and some characters use anti-Semitic statements as part of their worldview. For example, Edemsky's comrade and associate Zhuovyan attempts to analyze Dostoevsky's ideas from the perspective of their national subtext and speaks about the messianic Russian idea. Chernokotov rudely interrupts him in response, resorting to openly anti-Semitic statements, calling him a "Jew-Ovyan" and accusing him of "Semitic propaganda". Such outbursts demonstrate how easily literary discussion could degenerate into xenophobic rhetoric, exposing the underlying chauvinism of segments of the Soviet intelligentsia.

Chernokotov is one of the most radical characters in the play. He sees Dostoevsky as a national prophet and is ready to defend him from any attempts at criticism. These statements show that anti-Semitism in the play is not just a random phenomenon, but a conscious position of certain characters. It is not just a background element, but an important part of the overall ideological struggle. It is used to discredit opponents, as well as a way to emphasize the divide between the "Russian" and "Westernized" interpretations of Dostoevsky. Interestingly, some characters either do not react to Chernokotov's anti-Semitic remarks or try to calm him down, but do not condemn him. The discourse surrounding Dostoevsky evolves into a broader engagement with national and political tensions, revealing latent prejudices within the Soviet intelligentsia. What initially appears as a literary inquiry thus emerges as a deeper interrogation of national and ideological identity. Vasily Chernokotov is portrayed as an aggressive antisemite and pogromist; his interpretation of Dostoevsky's work is marked by hysterical fervor and chauvinistic distortion. It is understandable why the editorial board invites Moncevich and Shmuler-Dysny to discuss the monograph.

They are professors, which justifies their status as invited experts, although they do not clarify the situation. But Chernokotov is a college dropout, and his presence at an internal editorial event can only be explained by the growing influence of Russian nationalism. He simply should not have been at this meeting. Chernokotov, having no real influence on the outcome of the discussion, causes chaos with his anti-Semitic remarks, which increases the tension

of the conversation and reinforces the editorial board's reluctance to deal with risky topics. Chernokotov, like many characters in the play, sees Dostoevsky as the embodiment of the Russian idea and national mission. He "defends" Dostoevsky from Western concepts, which, in his opinion, attempt to distort the writer's legacy. In fact, Chernokotov is looking for a reason to cause a scandal and compromise both the author of the book under discussion and the entire editorial board:

> Come closer, you trembling creatures… Here I am… I have crossed the line… I have transgressed… I have power… I shout in your Semitic faces, I am Russian… What happiness it is to be Russian for all to hear… (Gorenstein 2019: 102)

After starting a fight and getting what he deserved, Chernokotov, beaten by the security guard Ivan, leaves the publishing house.

Starting as a professional discussion, the debate around Edemsky's book quickly escalates into an ideological dispute in which different positions clash. In Soviet literary studies, F.M. Dostoevsky was rehabilitated and established as a symbol of Russian culture, and any attempts to revise this status were closely monitored. Edemsky's atheistic interpretation is perceived as a threat to the fragile compromise between state atheism and the nationalist perception of the writer. In the play, Dostoevsky appears as a symbolic figure around whom ideological "fortifications" are erected. The play was written at a time when official ideology was trying to reconcile Dostoevsky with the Marxist worldview. Some characters, such as Edemsky, try to present Dostoevsky as an atheist and rationalist whose works can be explained by scientific psychoanalysis. Others, such as Trush or Chernokotov, defend Dostoevsky as a deeply religious writer, a national genius, a prophet of the Russian idea. Conflicts arise literally after every sentence spoken. For example, Edemsky says that Dostoevsky is "the comprehensive embodiment of ideal revisionism" and that his work can be analyzed as a scientific phenomenon. The nationalist and chauvinist Trush responds by accusing him of simplifying Dostoevsky's ideological issues and calling his approach "blasphemous". This conflict reflects the real struggle for the interpretation of Dostoevsky in Soviet culture. For some, he was a reactionary, for others, a great artist who predicted the horrors of the 20th century. The various characters represent different ideological views on Dostoevsky. Petruzov insists on protecting the writer from extremes – "dogmatists and decadents"; Trush condemns the tendency toward "self-flagellation" of national culture; and Khomyatov fears that Edemsky's work will open the way to undesirable interpretations that could undermine the established national myth.