LANGUAGE AND POLITICS IN POST-SOVIET RUSSIA

A CORPUS ASSISTED APPROACH

NELYA KOTEYKO

business[a] [ˈbɪznɪs] *n* 1) дело
профéссия; on ~ по дéлу;
the day (*или* of the meeting
дня; to mean ~ говорúть *или*
серьё о, дéльно; go abou
mi our own ~! не вмéши
в д ло!; what is your ~
нá to send smb. about
гнá вóлить когó-л.; good
шее д о!, здóрово!; a pretty

Language and Politics in Post-Soviet Russia

Language and Politics in Post-Soviet Russia

A Corpus-Assisted Approach

Nelya Koteyko
University of Leicester, UK

palgrave
macmillan

Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Preface

Although applicable to all spheres of life in Russia, the following quote from Lilia Shevtsova's book particularly aptly characterises the linguistic scene during the post-Soviet years: 'Post-communist Russia is a country of paradoxes. On the one hand, it is a model of endless movement. On the other, there is evidence all around of inertia and continuity' (Shevtsova, 1999: 1).

On the one hand, the changes in social, political and economic activity after perestroika were accompanied by profound linguistic transformations. Heralding a departure from the totalitarian past and its 'wooden' officialese, word play, irony, puns and archaisms together with loanwords and slang became increasingly abundant and even celebrated in Russian public discourse. Previous faithful representation of canonic Communist texts was replaced by a creative play on citations sourced from a variety of genres. This extraordinary sociolinguistic situation has been described in terms of carnivalisation, drawing on Bakhtin's work that examined how subversive, non-standard language subjects official discourse to ridicule (Kostomarov and Burvikova, 2001). On the other hand, however, as early as the mid-1990s it became apparent that this spirit of linguistic spontaneity did not mean a clean break from the past, as the widely denounced Soviet themes and lexis re-emerged in public discourse during this time. The rapid 'de-sovietisation' of the Russian language (Dunn, 1999) has started to show signs of inertia.

This book is an exploration of these linguistic and discursive under-pinnings of Russia's transition from the turbulent Yeltsin years to the new-found stability under Putin's presidency. It adopts a linguistic perspective to take a closer look at the media and political discourses after the carnival of the early 1990s, when the lack of ideological homogeneity became particularly apparent and Soviet narratives were given a new lease of life. Subscribing to the view that language both helps shape and is shaped by society and culture, the objectives of this research are twofold: to offer a historically contextualised analysis of political language use in Russia in the decade after the second presidential elections, and to examine and document changes in discursive trends. Given that political discourse is strategically in constant interaction with informal conversation (Chilton and Schäffner, 2002), particular attention is paid to the rhetorical role of the linguistic creativity that flooded post-Soviet

media and political texts. In this way, creative linguistic features are taken to be inextricably linked to evaluation and expression of political stance.

The use of language is one of the key research areas in political studies, and a range of established linguistic methodologies can be drawn upon to analyse political texts. The objective to analyse multiple and competing discourses, and chart discursive trends, necessitates a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches. For this reason, the framework of discourse analysis, which sees meaning as contingent on context, other texts, and interpretation will be combined with corpus linguistic techniques that provide the 'bigger' picture of linguistic patterns across large electronic archives. In this way, examination of how Russian political events and processes are structured and rendered linguistically is supported and enriched in this book through employment of frequency comparisons and visualisations in the form of concordances. The resulting enquiry will examine both the linguistic structures 'used to get politically relevant messages across' and their political function by taking into account the broader societal and historical contexts in which such discourses are embedded (Schäffner, 1997: 1). By providing corpus-based, systematic and detailed analyses of meaning in Russian newspaper texts and political speeches the book also aims to illuminate the analytical benefits of using corpora in political discourse analysis.

Although variously defined, the notion of discourse provides a good vantage point for exploring the extent to which everyday linguistic choices are constrained by existing norms while at the same time acknowledging individual creativity within these cultural and societal constraints (Hall, 2005). From this perspective, the emerging tradition of corpus-assisted discourse analysis offers a useful framework from which we can observe, reflect on, and critique these processes, described by Bakhtin in terms of competing centrifugal and centripetal forces in language use. Both recent corpus linguistic research on creativity in everyday conversations (Carter, 2004) and earlier work of Sinclair (1991) on the fundamentally 'prefabricated' nature of language have opened up important dimensions for exploring these tendencies and tracing the evaluative impact of creative manipulation of linguistic resources. In this book, the results emerging from the multiple means to query specialised corpora are expected to reveal the fluid and changing ideological constraints upon the discourses under study.

The degree to which language and the media were recruited to construct political identities, and particularly oppositional projects, varied

during different stages of Yeltsin's and Putin's presidencies, necessitating examination with a carefully calibrated diachronic lens. This is not an easy task given that political programmes of both Russian presidents, as well as those of their opponents, suffered from vagueness in ideological goals, notions and imagery. However, such lack of coherence should not stop us documenting the processes of change and stability that took place in a society rapidly introducing new sociopolitical structures and yet still entangled in the Soviet past. I therefore agree with Ryazanova-Clarke (2009: 290), who maintains that postmodern vagueness characterising Russian post-Soviet discourse 'does not prevent meanings from contestation for legitimacy and veracity as descriptions of the world and as a result, meanings may shift to clarity and sharpness'. The computer-assisted analysis of co-occurrence patterns as well of instances of paraphrase and metaphor will, I hope, enable me to reveal the changes and continuities in the subtle interplay between language and politics in post-Soviet Russia.

Acknowledgements

1
Introduction

This book is concerned with three main areas: corpus linguistics, Russian political discourse and the media. The key focus is the relationship between corpus linguistics and discourse analysis, in particular how such features as connotations and metaphors can be studied with the help of corpora. At the same time, this book is about a certain type of text and talk – that of politics and, specifically, Russian politics in the post-Soviet period, which so far has only rarely been approached from the perspective of critical linguistics. The third and final, and no less important, feature of this book lies in its linguistic and historically oriented analysis of Russian media texts, which represent a window into political and discursive realities of two presidencies. Below I will discuss these three themes in more detail.

1.1 Corpora and discourse

At present, corpus-based studies is one of the major research paradigms in linguistics. A relatively young discipline of corpus linguistics that relies on electronically stored texts to perform automated searches and frequency calculations has become widely popular, as it allows an unprecedented access to vast collections of naturally occurring data. In previous decades, corpus linguistics was mostly employed in the service of lexicography and language teaching. More recently, its methods have been used in a number of other areas of linguistic inquiry such as language description, language variation studies and forensic linguistics. These studies have demonstrated that a corpus linguistic framework offers reliable and replicable techniques that can be successfully applied to explore various facets of language use. At the same time, it is becoming increasingly apparent that we have by no means exhausted the vast

research potential offered by corpora. New applications, fresh perspectives on, and novel methods of, processing linguistic information held by large collections of machine-readable text have to be given much more consideration.

Here I want to explore an area where the application of corpus linguistic methods is particularly promising and challenging at the same time – the study of discourse. Discourses are constructed, at least in part, via language, and although there is hardly agreement on what constitutes discourse and subsequently what role language plays in it, it is still possible to carry out analysis of texts in order to uncover discursive processes. Media discourse, for example, has always attracted interest from critical linguists (Hodge and Kress, 1993; Fowler, 1991), as news journalism brings into focus (and often power) a range of different voices, especially those of leaders, celebrities and other figures of public attention. The pervasive influence of the media in contemporary society has inspired many studies by critical discourse analysts who scrutinise newspaper texts to uncover political and ideological agendas behind them (Fairclough, 1995b; Richardson, 2007; van Dijk, 1991). Such analyses have illuminated various stages in the process of recontextualisation of political phenomena in media coverage, and contributed to the ongoing debate on the role of journalism in the political process (Macgilchrist, 2011), including the growing literature on 'mediated democracy'.

For at least a decade now, corpus linguists have also shown an interest in the ideological implications of language use. This has translated into studies characterised by a mixed methods design, where the predominantly quantitative methodology of corpus linguistics is used to complement a qualitative inquiry set out within the parameters of discourse analysis. This book aims to contribute to this burgeoning interest in the corpus-based or corpus-assisted analysis of discourse (Partington, 2003, 2010, 2012; Partington et al., 2004; Baker and McEnery, 2005; Baker et al., 2008) by setting out to explore how corpus linguistics can serve as a methodological framework both for quantitative and qualitative analyses of political discourses. In common with the leading proponents of corpus linguistics, most notably Stubbs (1996, 2001), I advocate the use of corpus linguistic methodologies to explore ideological formations. In contrast with many corpus-based studies, however, my analysis does not stop at providing generalisations about uses of particular (usually politically or socially important) words in a given discourse, but goes further to unpack their meanings and uses as 'keywords' in the rich sense lent to the term by Raymond Williams (1983). Whereas lexicographic

descriptions, nowadays based on corpora, try to eliminate ambivalence and contradictions inherent in political and economic terms, the historical and cultural approach inspired by Williams' seminal work allows us to examine their possible contested meanings, treating such terms as nodes around which many historical and social realities can be explored. By developing linguistic descriptions which relate to culture and ideology, I want to explore and extend the points of synergy between corpus linguistics and critical discourse studies (CDS).

This approach seems particularly suited for the analysis of two post-Soviet sociolinguistic tendencies conditioned by various trials and tribulations of Russia's social, political and economic life. First, due to the reforms initiated during perestroika, language use became a key instrument in post-Soviet political discourse. Whereas in the West, 'linguistic politics' have gained importance in ideological confrontations since the 1960s, in Russia it is only during and after this transformation period that it became common to treat words and images as a useful material in political battles. To be clear, manipulation of public opinion through language use undoubtedly took place in the Soviet era, but such manipulation was not geared towards gaining political advantage due to absence of opposition. By contrast, the transition to the multi-party system highlighted the role of language in political campaigns, calling for dismantling of the authoritarian mode of discourse and using new linguistic devices to engage the electorate. As a result, as Anderson (1996) observes, the distance separating the register of politics from standard Russian was reduced by Gorbachev, and eventually eliminated by electoral politicians in the post-Soviet era.

Second, as the link between language change and politics is particularly acute during the time of social upheaval, the post-Soviet period represents a great opportunity to explore the processes of discursive change and stability, evident inter alia through the large-scale borrowing of new lexis. In the context of the post-perestroika reforms this process was most visible in the transformation of economy-related ideas and concepts, when the system of the market economy with its principles and implications was being accepted, but also at the same time adapted to certain ideas already existing in post-Soviet society. Familiar notions were being reinterpreted or rephrased and entered circulation in a new wording, accompanied by many foreign words imported to denote the new concepts, such as 'voucher' or 'privatisation'. Subsequently, meanings of these borrowed lexical items were being negotiated by members of the Russian discourse community. This led to their continual redefinition within the highly dynamic political environments of the first

post-Soviet decade. As a result, the loanwords acquired various, and often conflicting, connotations. Depending on the context, one and the same loanword could be used to describe a state of affairs either positively or negatively (Krysin, 1998; Ryazanova-Clarke and Wade, 1999). While the language of perestroika and the early post-Soviet period attracted significant attention from linguists and lexicographers, later years of Russian language evolution are comparatively less analysed, particularly by corpus linguists and discourse analysts.

It should therefore be clarified at the start that this book is not only about corpus linguistics being a valuable 'quantitative ally' for inherently qualitative studies of texts. Despite the current predominance of quantitative approaches that prioritise statistical recognition of patterns in large collections of electronic data, the pursuit of corpus linguistics does not preclude an intensive study of individual texts and text segments and the links between them. In this book I therefore discuss how principles of corpus compilation and techniques of data management based on currently available corpus linguistic software can allow a detailed and systematic analysis of intertextual links in a particular discourse. Such an approach fits well with the recent trend in discourse studies observed by Swan: 'On the whole … there does seem to have been a shift towards more localized studies' and 'far less reliance on quantifiable and/or general patterns' (2002: 59).

While the application of corpus linguistic methods to the study of media and political discourses is becoming popular, the number of studies fully engaging with the methodological and theoretical implications is still limited. Although this book also does not aim to cover this vast territory, the intention is to present a critical overview of methodological and theoretical points that emerge from the study of political discourse within the framework of corpus linguistics. A number of disciplinary and interdisciplinary endeavours are discussed in this process, including various strands in discourse analysis, media and cultural studies, as well as sociology and linguistics. In these disciplines, certain theoretical standpoints now prevail: the idea that realities are socially and linguistically constructed; that power relations are constructed and deconstructed through the uses of language, and that language is often the vehicle of social change. The discussion of a broad range of perspectives is necessary to account for this multifaceted nature of language as a social, cultural and historical entity.

A prominent place in the post-structuralist metalanguage and, as we will see further in this book, in some present-day approaches to discourse analysis, is occupied by the term 'intertextuality'. The concept

is currently employed in a range of areas from biblical criticism to the studies of film production and reception, and comes with its own history. At the broadest level, intertextuality refers to the view of text as a container of various references from another text or texts. However, since there are multiple ways in which texts can be seen as linked with each other, there can hardly be a single and encompassing definition of intertextuality. To gain appreciation for the term's many meanings and applications, one is advised to turn to Allen's comprehensive study (2000) that considers the various ways that intertextuality has been defined since its inception. Out of the many incarnations of the concept, I will refer to the notion of intertextuality born in the French intellectual *Weltanschauung* in the late 1960s (Allen, 2000), when an array of established concepts within philosophy, political science and psychoanalytic theory were being transformed by the critique of structuralism. This notion will be further adapted in the course of the corpus-assisted diachronic analysis, and in its most narrow sense will be used to refer to a specific form of inter-reference between texts.

The analysis of intertextual features is here to shed light on the emergence of meaning in discourse. Meanings of words are constantly in flux because we, as members of various discourse communities, (re-)negotiate them as society moves forward in time. As a rule, these changes in meaning are seen either as a language-internal process and therefore analysed with linguistic methods, or as language-external developments often studied with little regard to linguistic considerations within a socio-historical framework. This book argues that the diachronic analysis of meaning in discourse has to accommodate both aspects and treat them as complementary: a specific theory of meaning which draws on lexical semantics as well as a broader view of meaning as a product of social and cultural relationships.

The empirical part of this book is represented by a corpus-assisted analysis of post-Soviet political discourses between 1996 and 2007. The data selected for this study have two advantages over contemporary corpora compiled to explore discourses in Westernised countries. First, the vast majority of corpus-based analyses tend to rely on texts written in English or other languages of the European Union. In contrast, the principled collections of texts in this study consist of Russian newspaper texts and political speeches. Second, as a rule, present-day corpus data come from mainstream discourse as typical text sources are big circulation newspapers. The main focus of such corpus-assisted discourse studies therefore falls on the role of media in enforcing and perpetuating ideologies of the dominant groups (Fairclough, 2001), which necessarily

limits the possibilities to explore the use of lexical items in alternative or counter-discourses (Terdiman, 1985). This book sets out to overcome this limitation by studying language use in corpora sourced both from mainstream newspapers and small-circulation periodicals of the opposition.

1.2   Russian politics in the post-Soviet period

It is not within the remit of this book to even begin detailing the social and political transformations that took place in Russia during the period of Boris Yeltsin's and Vladimir Putin's presidencies which span over a decade. Such overviews and detailed accounts are available elsewhere, namely in the work of Shevtsova (1999, 2003, 2007a, b), Sakwa, (2008), White et al. (2010), White (2010, 2011) and many others. In this introductory chapter it seems more appropriate to sketch the basic trends in Russian political thought to the extent that they relate to my data. The next section engages with the media industry side of these socio-economic transformations, whereas the ensuing discursive shifts are discussed in Chapter 3.

The period between the breakdown of one regime and emergence of another was of course a highly turbulent time in Russia. The core of the difficulties experienced by the Russian ruling elite at the beginning of the first post-Soviet decade is poignantly described by Shevtsova as the time when 'Yeltsin and his team were forced to attempt *four revolutions* at once: create a free market, democratize the state, abolish an empire and create a non-imperial Russia, and seek a new geopolitical role for a former nuclear superpower that had been for decades an adversary of the West' (2007b: 892, original emphasis). The results of this undertaking were not far short of disastrous, and the decade of 1989–99 became known as the time of political paralysis in the absence of any political infrastructure, as well as of great economic instability and decline. Whereas, in theory, the monopoly of the Communist Party was superseded by political pluralism, in practice, 'ideology took a back seat to market reforms, competition, and repudiation of government control' (Cohen, 2006: 1). As documented by Zassoursky, this was particularly true for the second half of the 1990s when a number of political formations established by the governing elites lacked a coherent programme or 'any rooting in the society' (2004: 75). Only the Communist Party of the Russian Federation (CPRF/KPRF) proved to be an exception in this regard by presenting a more or less unified opposition front, which, however, was not free from ideological contradictions and instability (March, 2002; White, 2011).

From 1996 onwards, the discursive political field was described in terms of the struggle between the state, democrats, Communists and patriots to formulate a 'Russian idea' – as part of Yeltsin's project to develop a unifying ideology (Urban, 1998). All participants engaged in a bitter discursive contest where neither side was willing adopt ideas proposed by their opponents. This eventually had disastrous consequences for political debate, turning into a simple blame game characterised by absence of a 'common political language' (Urban, 1998: 969). These attempts to provide new ideological foundations also became fairly polarised. Malinova (2009) suggests two broad labels – 'democrats' (демократы) and 'popular patriotic opposition' (народно-патриотическая оппозиция) – for the key players in the political field in this period. The confrontation between these two heterogeneous groups was of course far from the only ideological fault line in Yeltsin's Russia, as a number of additional movements and ideological currents competed in the same space. However, their debates, centred on the problem of reforms and the search for national identity, dominated the discursive political field. For this reason, the necessarily simplifying labels 'democrats' and 'patriotic opposition', which describe 'clusters of discourses whose seeming unity was very much determined by this major opposition' (Malinova, 2009: 98) are adopted further in this study.

According to Malinova (2009), the discourse of 'democrats' was based on a version of liberal democratic ideology developed in the early post-perestroika years. The main proponents were the liberal parties such as Democratic Choice of Russia (Демократический Выбор России) later called the Union of the Right Forces (Союз Правых Сил) and Yabloko. The key notions of this discourse were also used by centrist parties and in programmes of state officials. At the centre of this discourse was the vision of a new Russia, untarnished by the Soviet past and driven by the Western-style reforms and ideas, such as the primacy of the individual over class or ethnic group, a market economy, private property and democratic political institutions (ibid.). In this way, in their assessment and re-evaluation of the national past 'democrats' clearly distanced themselves from the Soviet experience. Direct opposition to such a view was evident in the political standpoint of Communists and patriots, united in their objection to the programme of 'democrats-Westernisers' and their allies in the state. This discourse was even more heterogeneous, drawing on a range of left-wing and nationalist or patriotic ideas synthesised in the first half of the 1990s (Urban, 1998). This Communist–patriotic synthesis combined core features of Marxism-Leninism with criticism of liberalism

and Westernism, along with nationalist and traditionalist ideas thrown into the mix.

Vladimir Putin's time in power since he became interim president in January 2000 is characterised as 'the regime of political consolidation' (Breslauer, 2005), aimed at stabilising the economy and state. Although some of his policies can be considered successful in economic terms, the increasingly authoritarian tendencies in Putin's leadership raised significant doubts about the possibility of liberal democracy (Shevstova, 2007a). Putin's political views and contradictory ideological principles are an eclectic and strategic mix, which, according to Zassoursky (2004), can be viewed as a result of the decade-long evolution of the Russian political system. Thus, in his political rhetoric and public image Putin embodied some of the most successful strategies of his political predecessors and contemporaries (Zassoursky, 2004: 138), such as patriotism, expansion of the Orthodox Church, liberalism in the economy, as well as adventurist traits reflected in macho language and behaviour.

By 2007 Russia's political course was still unmarked by ideological coherence, although political scientists generally agree that three 'epicentres' of Russian political thought, necessarily broadly conceived, can be distinguished: the liberal (Westernised), conservative/revolutionary (Slavophile), and conservative/preservationist (Okara, 2007: 11). The Westernisers insist on modernisation subscribing to such values as liberty, individualism and market economic principles. Politicians and political projects include Mikhail Kasyanov, Irina Khakamada, Anatoly Chubais, Boris Nemtsov, the Union of Right Forces and Yabloko. Slavophiles espouse the view of modernisation based on development, a mix of traditions and innovation, and patriotism. Political projects include the Rodina Party in the early periods of its history, and some ideological currents of the CPRF, as well as the National Bolshevik Party, supported by the newspaper *Zavtra* and People's Radio. Standing apart from these two trends are representatives of the preservationist trend who seek to bolster the existing social relationships and state structure, prioritising order, stability, as well as continuity of power, and patriotism. Proponents and followers include Boris Gryzlov, Sergei Ivanov, Vladimir Zhirinovsky, the United Russia Party, the Liberal Democratic Party of Russia (LDPR); and such media as ORT television and the state-run RTR broadcasting company (Okara, 2007: 12–13).

Given the focus on oppositional meaning-making, specific attention to the Communist Party of the Russian Federation is perhaps warranted. Despite the demise of the Communist regime, the party is considered to be one of the strongest political formations in Russia and has been

referred to as 'real' – that is, not Kremlin-manufactured opposition that has 'structure and organization' (Ishiyama, 2006: 4). During the 1996 national elections its leader Gennady Zyuganov came second; whereas the party on the whole enjoyed continuing success in regional elections. Following the doctrine of 'state patriotism', the party rhetoric first placed emphasis on socially oriented economic reforms, and then, after the 1996 election, shifted attention to independence from the West in foreign policy and cultural identity (Tsipko, 1996). With Putin's accession to power, however, the CPRF toned down its radical oppositional stance on some key issues into alliance with the Kremlin (Ryabov, 2012). The integration of the CPRF leadership into the post-Soviet political elite was accompanied by links and contacts with many businesses at national and regional levels. In Chapter 8, I show how this contradictory move (by a party that consistently criticised the introduction of free market reforms throughout the 1990s) is accommodated in the CPRF discourse.

1.3   Russian media

In post-Soviet Russia, the discussion of media has to be situated in the context of transformations it has undergone since the early 1990s, that is, from propaganda tools in the service of state ideology to platforms reflecting various political and economic interests. The lack of autonomy and instrumentalisation of the media stand out as the key points to be taken into account in this regard, since the subsystems of politics, economics, law and media have never been clearly distinguished from each other in Russian history (de Smaele, 1999).

   The breakdown of the Soviet Union brought with it the collapse of the media structure. Instead of the earlier centralised system, a number of regional and localised print media outlets sprang up and disappeared in the following decade, mirroring the sociopolitical instability in the country. The period of independent media characteristic of the early 1990s was short-lived. Television, the only remaining media with a national reach, quickly became a target for various ownership deals. Together with the private buyout of some of the major newspapers, this led to the creation of the notorious oligarch media empires (Nordenstreng and Pietiläinen, 2010). In the absence of large political institutions these politicised media companies performed the function of political parties by mobilisation of resources and lobbying decisions (Zassoursky, 2004). Consequently, this was the period when politics and media became 'completely intertwined', so much so that by the end of

1997 it was possible to speak of the formation of the 'media-political system' (2004: 20–3).

The triumph of this 'media-political system' was most apparent in the 1996 presidential elections. According to Koltsova (2006), from this period onwards we can also speak not only about manipulation of mass media through ownership deals and imposition of ideological views on newspaper editors, but also about the role of news values and global media 'laws' in Russian politics. This was reflected in the process of agenda selection, as well as techniques corresponding to the standards of the commercial media. One of the most obvious manifestations was preference for sensational stories that culminated in 'informational wars' or 'kompromat wars', where kompromat stands for discrediting or compromising material distributed through media outlets influenced by hostile groups (2006: 38).

Further down in the media history, the year of 1999 saw several important events: Vladimir Putin becoming prime minister, outbreak of the second Chechen war and the beginning of what was referred to as the end of the oligarchs' era (Koltsova, 2006). Putin's 'state consolidation' project found reflection in the increasing role of the state and renationalisation of major media (Koltsova, 2006). An agreed information policy developed by the government followed suit, together with an unprecedented tactic of combining concealment of negative information with 'professionally created positive information flow' (ibid.: 40), including reports on the prime minister's official trips and visits, statements and commentaries on various events and occasions (Maslennikova, 2008).

By 2007, and towards the end of my study period, the ownership of the Russian media industry became divided between state-controlled capital and commercial capital. At the same time, the media continued to be not only 'the dependent variable' but also 'an independent variable' with such factors as the global media environment, technological developments and economic laws enabling journalists and elites to pursue their own agendas (Greene, 2009: 57). How far this system reflects the system under Soviet rule therefore remains a difficult question. Oates (2009: 29), for example, puts forward a 'neo-Soviet model of the media' arguing that, despite the diversity of media ownership forms, 'realistically there is no central media outlet that can challenge the Kremlin's monopoly on power and information'. Beumers et al. (2008), in their volume with a telling title *The Post-Soviet Russian Media: Conflicting Signals*, avoid a definitive stance on the issue, referring to 'the ever-shifting sands of the post-Soviet media landscape' (p. 25). In

my view this description is successful in that it captures the far from homogeneous media environment in a country that displays elements of both autocracy and democracy in political and legal institutions (Nordenstreng and Pietiläinen, 2010).

1.4 Structure and intended audience

This book is an attempt to combine methods and theories of several fields: corpus linguistics, media studies, discourse analysis and Russian political history, and is therefore likely to be of interest to students and colleagues in and across those domains. In particular, Chapters 2–4 explore research issues, methods and techniques of the above fields, and are directed towards a broad audience of interested readers, thus aiming to enhance an interdisciplinary exchange.

Writing about *meaning, discourse* and *intertextuality* in the context of structuralism and post-structuralism requires extensive clarification of these notions. Chapter 2 therefore outlines the main operational concepts employed in this study and provides a theoretical and methodological centre from which analyses are carried out and findings are interpreted further in the book. The discussion is structured around the traditional distinction between diachronic and synchronic approaches to dealing with linguistic facts: the study of language at a given moment in time, and analysis of linguistic development through time (Saussure, 1974). The point highlighted here is that corpus linguistics provides methodology suitable both for making generalisations about meaning on the basis of quantitative analysis and for carrying out an in-depth analysis of meaning through the study of paraphrases.

Chapter 3 provides an overview of sociolinguistic changes that took place in the post-perestroika period, arguing that attention to stylistic and pragmatic uses of words can deliver additional insights into the change of culture and ideology. Two specific elements essential to such analysis are discussed next: the concepts of 'word meaning' and 'metaphor'. The final part of the chapter relates the broad linguistic trends to parallel sociopolitical and discursive shifts.

Chapter 4 describes the processes of text selection undertaken during the compilation of corpora in this study. As data-gathering is never theory-free and 'collecting, managing and interpreting corpus findings is in itself a highly theoretical activity' (Halliday, 2006: 295), particular attention is paid to the role that methods of data collection and management play in corpus-assisted discourse analysis. The chapter opens with a discussion of the advantages inherent in specialised corpora from

the perspective of discourse analysis and proceeds to explicate the set of criteria guiding the compilation of corpora in this study.

Chapters 5–7 detail the analyses of loanwords and metaphors. The quantitative synchronic analysis carried out in Chapter 5 allows me to document and catalogue conflicting definitions of economy-related loanwords in the discourses of different Russian newspapers. A diachronic investigation through paraphrases in Chapter 6 then delves into historical aspects by investigating how and why the loanwords, the majority of which function as semi-technical terms from the sphere of business and economics in English, became used in Russian as political catchwords – words around which ideological battles are fought. Chapter 7 extends analysis of the post-Soviet discourse (and the chronological frame) by looking into the use of metaphors in Putin's speeches. Finally, discussion of the overall results, as well as implications intended to be a basis for further discussion, are explored in Chapter 8.

2
Perspectives on Corpus-Assisted Discourse Analysis

The multiplicity of approaches that study communication make an attempt to define discourse a difficult task. The first part of this chapter focuses on some of the key ideas that influenced the development of this concept in linguistics, cultural studies and sociology, and the different understandings of text and context they invite, in order to contextualise its use in the field of corpus-assisted discourse analysis (Partington, 2003). In contrast to early corpus linguistics studies interested solely in the lexico-grammatical properties of texts, this book is about the linguistic and the social and how each is represented in the theories of discourse. It is therefore hoped that this discussion will elucidate how a study of repositories can contribute not only to the quantitative analysis of lexis and syntax but also to discourse analysis aimed at interpretation of lexical items in a particular sociopolitical context, that is studies where discourse is theorised as a complex relationship between language, ideology and society (Wodak, 1989).

The second part covers the methodological background, while continuing the discussion of synergistic points between discourse analysis and corpus linguistics. Particular attention is paid to the construction of a theoretical framework for an in-depth diachronic analysis. Whereas the synchronic (structuralist) approach focuses on language as a system of meaning, where the emphasis is on the actual, the repetitive and the systematisable, the approach introduced here adopts a diachronic perspective on the exchange of meanings within particular contexts and discourses. In this regard, corpus linguistics offers a framework in which interpretation is based on a detailed study of intertextual links in a chronologically organised collection of texts.

2.1 Approaches to discourse and discourse analysis

The concept of discourse in linguistics and social sciences

For the past three decades, the concept of discourse has undoubtedly played an increasingly important role in social sciences and humanities. The term implies a complex link between linguistic and social spheres, and different approaches construe this relationship on different terms. Currently, the notion is employed across a range of disciplines, and can mean 'something as specific as spoken language, or something as general as the social process of communication' (Lemke, 1995: 6). This led Widdowson (1995: 169) to suggest that *discourse* has been used so widely that it no longer has any definable meaning.

In linguistics, for example, at least two definitions of the term have been elaborated: discourse as language above the sentence level, and as language in use.[1] Typical linguistic studies in this tradition examine how lexical and grammatical forms take on meanings in particular contexts, by paying attention to speaker/writer intentions, conversational rules and maxims, and various ways of analysing inferences. The view of context in such approaches excludes social and political forces behind all communicative acts, which made Pennycook (1994: 118) describe such analyses as 'decontextualised'. When proponents of these frameworks examine how the context affects language use, they do not pay attention to possible ideological influences, viewing language users as more or less autonomous actors. Predictably, such analysis would not be easily rendered into a study of political discourse, as it is not possible to do a critical analysis of text by only interrogating text. On this point I agree with Blommaert (2005) who maintains that if we are to take a serious view of context and achieve a socially sensitive analysis of language, we must engage with developments in social theory, and move beyond text. Below I outline theoretical contributions that have had most influence over my approach in this book: those of Bakhtin, Foucault, Bourdieu and Pêcheux.

The theory of heteroglossia and critical hermeneutics formulated by Michael Bakhtin (in tandem with Pavel Medvedev and Valentin Voloshinov) occupies a central place in the discourse analysis presented here. Aiming to elaborate the social dimension of discourse, Bakhtin proposes that 'the actual reality of language/speech is not the abstract system of linguistic forms, nor the isolated monologic utterance, nor the psychophysiological act of its implementation, but the social event of verbal interaction implemented in an utterance or utterances'

(Bakhtin, 1986: 94). In other words, the production and circulation of utterances, or meaning-making activity, is not subject to one individual because a verbal act 'inevitably orients itself with respect to previous performances in the same sphere, both those by the same author and those by other authors'. Rather, we make sense of every word or utterance against the background of other words or utterances, which implies, as Lemke (1995: 23) points out, that it is essential 'to understand just which other texts a particular community considers relevant to the interpretation of any given text'.

Crucially for the ideological analysis of discourse, such texts or utterances bear traces of the struggle over meaning. Linguistic signs are therefore seen as carriers of an 'evaluative accent', which may vary among different groups of users. In texts, these accents can be reflected as an interplay between several *voices*: 'the ideological becoming of a human being . . . is the process of selectively assimilating the words of others' (Bakhtin, 1981: 134). From this discursive perspective, every instance of word use is not neutral and bears traces of collective valuations and interpretations developed by its previous users. A member of the Bakhtin circle, Pavel Medvedev (1978) used the term 'ideologeme' to emphasise this ideological load carried by utterances.

Bakhtin's insight that no text exists in isolation profoundly informed analysis of the relations between language and social practice, and made heteroglossia a popular framework in a number of disciplines. In literary studies, the heteroglossic view of meaning and discourse was later termed the 'principle of intertextuality' in Julia's Kristeva's essay 'Word, Dialogue, and Novel'; a principle based on the notion that any text 'is constructed of a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another' (Kristeva, 1980: 66). Similarly, the notion of *recontextualisation* widely employed in many contemporary analyses of discourse (Blackledge, 2005), is also based on the work of Bakhtin, for whom:

> [. . .] the speech of another, once enclosed in a context, is – no matter how accurately transmitted – always subject to certain semantic changes. The context embracing another's word is responsible for its dialogising background, whose influence can be very great. Given the appropriate methods of framing, one may bring about fundamental changes even in another's utterance accurately quoted. Any sly and ill-disposed polemicist knows very well which dialogising backdrop he should bring to bear on ... accurately quoted words ..., in order to distort their sense. (Bakhtin, 1984: 78)

Another approach to discourse informing this study is that of Michel Foucault and his focus on statements rather than texts. According to Foucault, a statement subscribes to certain concepts and can be identified as such only against the backdrop of formulations that it implicitly or explicitly refers to, by the way of modifying them, repeating them or opposing them. Echoing Bakhtin's insights, statements always invoke other statements in one way or another, and discourse analysis is therefore concerned with 'the rules (practices, technologies) which make a certain statement possible to occur and others not at particular times, places and institutional locations' (Foucault, 1972/1989: 21). This kind of analysis aims to clarify why particular knowledge is articulated in the specified time period, and how it finds reflection in the meanings of lexical items.

As Foucault's view of discourse does not include the concept of ideology there still remains the difficulty of explaining the ways in which *oppositional* political ideologies are constituted and function (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985: 134–45). In this regard, Howarth (2002) suggests supplementing Foucault's genealogical account of discourse with a post-Marxist concept of hegemonic practice. In a similar way, Michel Pêcheux successfully incorporates the concept of oppositional ideologies into his theory of discourse. In his *Language, Semantics and Ideology*, for example, Pêcheux presents discourse as an intermediate link between language and ideology, arguing that 'every discursive process is inscribed into an ideological class relationship' (1982: 59). Here words are not seen as having their own 'basic' or denotational meaning, rather meaning arises from 'the metaphorical relationships' realised in 'substitution effects, paraphrases, synonym formations' in a given discursive formation (Pêcheux, 1982: 188). Meaning is seen as dependent on a complex system of statements and is influenced by the discursive practice. New meanings of lexical items arise from interdiscursive relations and are the result of the struggle for power – a position that echoes the account of meaning formulated by Bakhtin and Voloshinov.

This necessarily limited excursus into the social theories of discourse would not be complete without reference to the influential contributions of Pierre Bourdieu. Indeed, his approach is central to the reflection on, and categorisation of, different time periods in Russian political discourse in the next chapter of this book. Of central importance here is that Bourdieu, in line with the above-mentioned theorists, argues that dominant discourses gain influence through the production of specific ways of speaking and naming the world, that is by exercising their 'symbolic power' (Bourdieu, 1991). Through his concept of

habitus, he also tells us that what is common sense is essentially historically and culturally grounded: 'One of the fundamental effects of the orchestration of habitus is the production of a commonsense world endowed with the objectivity secured by consensus on the meaning of practices and the world' (1977: 80). This position concerns the struggle to impose the legitimate meaning and echoes Bakhtin's insight regarding the multi-accentuality of words.

Corpus linguistics and corpus-assisted discourse analysis

Corpus research is a methodological approach based on collecting and analysing large amounts of real-life language data. To examine the data contained in corpora, researchers utilise different types of text analysis software, which, however, share a set of common features that enable quantification as well as different ways of sorting the patterns retrieved. Such features include generation of *keywords* (words with a high frequency when compared to some norm); *frequency* lists (lists of words organised by frequency of occurrence or alphabetically); *concordances* (presenting a given search word or phrase in all of its contexts); and *collocates* (words that co-occur with a search word or phrase). Analysis of data pre-processed in this way allows us to establish typical patterns of language use that may escape native speaker intuition.

The above techniques are increasingly being used to supplement both discourse analysis in applied linguistics – (the 'non-critical' discourse analysis employed in language teaching, for example) and critical discourse analysis (CDA) aimed at revealing ideological biases based on the analysis of lexical patterns (Hardt-Mautner, 1995; Krishnamurthy, 1996; Stubbs, 1997, 2001; Orpin, 2005; Koteyko, 2012). Proponents of CDA or, more recently, critical discourse studies (CDS), draw on both linguistic and critical theory definitions of the term to emphasise that the focus should be on 'not just describing discursive practices, but also showing how discourse is shaped by relations of power and ideologies, and the constructive effects discourse has upon social identities, neither of which is normally apparent to discourse participants' (Fairclough, 1992: 12). This direction in discourse analysis operates within a broader understanding of context, where subject is 'interpellated' by ideology (Althusser, 1971). Drawing on an eclectic mix of theses by influential social theorists, including those discussed above, CDA aims to establish clear connections between the use of language and the exercise of power. Discourse is seen as both socially constituted and socially constitutive as it produces objects of knowledge, social identities and relationships (Fairclough, 1995a).

It is widely acknowledged that CDA is not a homogeneous method or a set of methods under a unitary theoretical framework (Wodak, 2011). On the contrary, one can speak of several schools or strands of CDA, which vary in their theoretical and methodological positions. What they have in common, however, is attention to the way specific linguistic features and structures are deployed in the reproduction of social dominance (van Dijk, 2009). The concern with structural properties of a text means that attention is paid to the systematic features, as the aim is to identify regularities in discourses (after Foucault's view of discourse as a set of systematically organised statements). Different domains are seen as characterised by specific discourse–power relationships, where the corresponding institutions use language to produce and sustain their dominance.

Detailing the models developed within the framework of CDA would far exceed the scope of this chapter (see e.g. Wodak and Meyer, 2009; Weiss and Wodak, 2003). Instead, I will briefly outline the main tenets of the discourse historical approach (DHA) as it is the theoretical perspective underpinning the study of textual and intertextual features in this book. The approach distinguishes between four 'levels of context' studied in recursive manner:

1. The immediate, textual level, or co-text;
2. The intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between texts, text segments and discourses, and their histories of use;
3. The sociological variables and institutional frames, such as specific election campaigns, for example; and
4. The broader sociopolitical and historical contexts, within which the discursive practices are embedded (Richardson and Wodak, 2009: 255).

A specific feature of this approach is incorporation of memory into the definition of discourse, which foregrounds its historical focus.

The DHA builds on the argumentation theory and the notion of discursive strategies employed by actors to present arguments either positively or negatively (Reisigl and Wodak, 2009). The positive presentation instantiates legitimisation, which as Cap (2006) explains, signals the speaker's authority by means of strategies realised either explicitly or implicitly, such as 'the awareness and/or assertion of the addressee's wants and needs, reinforcement of global and indisputable ideological principles, charismatic leadership projection, boasting about one's performance' and so on (Cap, 2006: 13). By contrast, delegitimisation strategies include negative presentation of the opposition through

'blaming, scape-goating, marginalizing, excluding, attacking the moral character of the adversary' (ibid.). The strategies arise from the *ideological square* (van Dijk, 1998: 267), the rules of which require us to 'express/emphasize information that is positive about US and express/emphasize information that is negative about THEM' and, conversely, 'suppress/de-emphasize information that is positive about THEM and suppress/de-emphasize information that is negative about US' (ibid.).

CDA has its critics. A number of concerns have been raised in relation to its methods of data collection and analysis in particular (Breeze, 2011). Meyer (2001), for example, points out that the interpretative procedure adopted by the CDA proponents as a method of identifying and summarising meaning relations presupposes that a substantial amount of data is analysed. Some CDA studies, however, adopt a rather 'text-reducing' method of analysis as they concentrate on clear formal properties of a small number of texts, therefore contradicting their 'hermeneutic endeavour' (Meyer, 2001: 16). Furthermore, CDA scholars identify changes in meanings of lexical items when they expose ideologically driven connotations; however, their limited use of textual sources prevents them from documenting these changes either diachronically (Carvalho, 2008) or quantitatively (Stubbs, 1997). In order to overcome the criticism of using 'impressionistic' methodology (Breeze, 2011), CDA analyses are sometimes carried out on multi-million word corpora that offer a representative picture of linguistic trends (Mautner, 2009). In other cases, as acknowledged in recent CDA studies (Wodak and Meyer, 2009), a more systematic approach to data collection and analysis is adopted (see Chapter 4).

Mautner (2005, 2007), Partington (2003, 2010) and Baker (2005, 2006) have written extensively on methodological issues underpinning the merging of corpus linguistics and CDA. Such studies introduce frequency and quantification into the definition of discourse, relying on the assumption that words tend to be used in recurrent structures and word combinations. Stubbs, for example, views discourse as 'constellations of repeated meanings' that produce conventional ways of talking about things, which in turn affects attitudes and opinions (Stubbs, 2001: 147). Baker (2005: 16) also refers to the usefulness of corpus techniques in tracing the 'incremental effect of discourse', maintaining that 'it is difficult to conceptualise discourse without considering difference and frequency – two concepts which are well-suited to quantitative approaches'. While the CDA procedure can help us reveal that certain structural features belong to a particular discourse, it does not provide a way of establishing whether such patterns are well entrenched and

therefore can be taken as evidence of hegemonic discourse, or whether they actually represent a minority discourse. Collection and analysis of large corpora help to address this point by supplying cumulative evidence (which, however, still needs careful interpretation, given that discourses are never discrete entities). In this regard, Mautner (2009) provides examples of how a single newspaper article can be interpreted with the help of a multi-million word corpus of British English.

Other advantages of performing corpus-based discourse analysis listed in Baker (2006: 10–16) include: reducing researcher bias as corpus analysis enables us to 'place a number of restrictions on our cognitive biases'; providing knowledge of 'how language is drawn on to construct discourses or various ways of looking at the world' to increase our resilience to manipulation by text producers; revealing counter-examples in the form of resistant and changing discourses; and, finally, by providing triangulation as the use of multiple techniques facilitates validity checks. Baker et al. (2008) further develop a nine-stage model of corpus-assisted CDA that allows for generation and testing of new hypotheses by switching between various qualitative and quantitative techniques. Although the authors recognise potential incompatibilities between the theory-driven CDA framework and either 'theory-driven, or data- and goal-driven' (2008: 273) corpus linguistic approaches, they also discuss the overlapping points.

These corpus-assisted analyses provide a cogent demonstration of how the application of corpus linguistic principles can strengthen the interpretative basis of CDA. However, they almost exclusively focus on overcoming the limitations of synchronic CDA studies by analysing static snapshots of discourse. Given that discourses are always in flux and in constant dialogue with each other, can corpus linguistics contribute to the diachronic analysis?

So far short-term and discourse-specific changes in connotations have not received much attention from researchers who use corpus linguistic methods to study the complex relationship between language, ideology and society. Existing diachronic studies rely on quantitative methodology to identify and document morphosyntactic and semantic shifts (Leech, 2002; Sigley and Holmes, 2002). They necessarily operate with abstractions, as texts processed with software are treated as objects separated from their cultural background and discourses of the original language users. The analyses tend to be based on *general language* or *reference corpora* – collections of texts compiled to represent a variety of genres or covering long periods in the history of the language (e.g. Helsinki corpora, see Kytö, 1996). Although invaluable for studies of historical variation and change, such corpora are of little use for those linguists

and social scientists who want to explore how certain lexical items have been adopted, defined and redefined by specific discourse communities. A recent special issue of the journal *Corpora* presents a welcome exception in this regard, detailing analyses that demonstrate how large collections of electronic text can be used to illuminate both internal linguistic processes and changes in meaning conditioned by external events (Partington, 2010).

A combination of corpus linguistic principles and a qualitative study of discourse as a concrete socio-historical formation characterised by particular ways of using language is therefore a rare scholarly phenomenon (but see Teubert, 2003; 2005a; Glasze, 2007; Koteyko, 2007). At first glance, the incompatibility in the analytical approach is apparent. Whereas CDA takes social, historical and political context into account, corpus linguistics is often criticised for its 'decontextualised' approach to language use (Widdowson, 2004). However, as the recent corpus-assisted studies (Partington, 2010; Duguid, 2010) have shown, corpus linguists do not necessarily have to disregard context in their studies and can build ways of assessing underlying sociocultural background into the overall framework. Teubert (2005a), for example, argues that for corpus linguists interested in the analysis of meanings as a product of social and cultural relationships, discourse is a totality of texts produced by language users who identify themselves as members of a social group on the basis of the commonality of their world views. This view of discourse echoes the above-cited position of Foucault (1972/1989: 80) who refers to discourse as an 'individualisable group of statements' – statements which seem to exemplify a similar set of concerns and which have some coherence, for example 'discourse of organic food promotion' or 'discourse of the British left wing press'.

Overall then, modern corpus-assisted analyses of discourse have demonstrated significant insights into the cumulative ideological effect of repeated language use. What such synchronic analyses do not reveal, however, is how members of a discourse community work together within a relatively contained textual network, such as a set of texts responding to one another in the confines of a single discourse community and within a specific period of time. A corpus-assisted study of such a network can reveal how ideology is developed and maintained through mutually supporting statements that may originate in multiple genres (in media discourse these would be, for example, editorials, readers' letters and political interviews). When such statements are connected in time and space, a diachronic examination of the network as a whole can provide insight into the construction, maintenance or rejection of ideological meanings.

2.2   Combining synchronic and diachronic perspectives: the approach in this book

'Discourse' in this study

It is time to introduce the view of discourse adopted in this book. As discussed above, for traditional linguistics discourse is language in use rather than a complex entity that extends into the realms of ideology, strategy and practice. However, recent corpus-assisted analyses of discourse have convincingly argued that these two approaches are not irreconcilable and can be profitably combined in the study of political language. Here I draw on these synchronic studies to examine the relationship between lexical co-occurrence and ideological meaning-making in comparable corpora of media texts. I then extend this framework by merging corpus linguistic and discourse historical methods to focus on changes and continuities in Russian post-Soviet discourse. The resulting framework of corpus-assisted diachronic analysis views discourse as a collection of thematically interrelated texts produced and interpreted within particular social and spatial frames.

In the course of such analyses, two main questions will be posed of the data. First, driven by the agenda of applied linguistics and relying on its inventory of lexico-grammatical means, I will ask: what are the rules governing the production of a particular word combination, and other constructions related to it? Here a focus on repeated events can be harnessed to unearth the interrelationship between language and ideology (Baker et al., 2008). The choice of semiotic resources on the micro-level of discursive interaction is seen as a reflection of the relations on the macro-level of social structures and vice versa. Second, following the social theory of discourse, it is equally important to question: why this particular statement and not another? Whereas the first point can be addressed through the study of linguistic factors (lexical patterns), the second question has to be explored through systematic analysis of different levels of context. The resulting enquiry will incorporate both description and explanation in an attempt to examine meanings construed by members of a discourse community.

The approach shares with DHA a socio-constructionist approach to meaning, which places emphasis 'not on the individual mind but on the meanings created by people as they collectively generate descriptions and explanations in language' (Gergen and Gergen, 1991: 78), and the view of discourse as both linguistic and material (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985). At the same time, critique in this book is somewhat different from the DHA stance of the engaged critic with an overt political position. Rather

the focus is on laying bare the contingencies behind acts of discourse and examining their active functions and social outcomes. Such critical engagement draws on socio-historical as well as theoretical data in explaining instances of language use.

The post-structuralist view of meaning as a transient and changing phenomenon necessitates a much larger 'archive' of statements to look for additions and changes to meaning than is normally compiled by discourse analysts. It is important to stress, however, that a large quantity of real language data is only one essential component of corpus-assisted studies elaborated here. Chronological arrangement and full documentation of texts (recording as many aspects of production as is practicable) represent two further key constituents. In other words, the analyst needs to compile and document a corpus that is not merely a large machine-readable archive for fast searches and frequency calculations (important as these are in providing generalisations about meaning) but is also a window into social and historical aspects of meaning production. This resonates with the DHA view of discourse as a corpus of statements whose organisation is systematic and subject to certain regularities. However, whereas DHA aims to collect data across multiple discourses, genres and fields of action, in this study the emphasis is on a single discourse community and networks of texts within it.

Overall, the systematic analysis of linguistic forms in newspaper texts and political speeches will be the basis for investigation. However, considering the predominance of internal content criteria, such as common topics and intertextual connections in the corpora make-up, the analytical frames differ from traditional linguistic approaches. Recognising that analysis of discourse cannot remain simply *within* the text, but needs to shift between the text and extra-textual factors, the DHA principles will be drawn upon to provide a grounded understanding of how the texts are constructed in relation to the sociocultural and sociopolitical contexts in which they are produced.

Paraphrases as sources of information on meaning

By placing emphasis on quantitative patterns, synchronic corpus-assisted studies inevitably disregard individual instances of language use that might have led to the revision of meaning of lexical items being considered. Baker's (2011) analysis of multiple English language corpora, for example, reveals the existence of what he calls 'lockwords' – words which may change their meaning when compared through a set of diachronic corpora, but which at the same time appear to be relatively static in terms of frequency (p. 66). How and why such words have acquired a different

meaning are questions rarely asked within the framework of corpus linguistics. This part of the chapter is therefore aimed at researchers who want to recruit corpus linguistic methods in the analysis of recent changes in word use in particular discourses while paying due attention to the complex relationship between language and society. Such application of special-purpose corpora in a diachronic study of discourse relies both on the principles of corpora compilation and management and a specific methodological framework, which is discussed next.

The diachronic view shifts attention to the journey a particular word has made to arrive at its current meaning. This perspective takes the notion of meaning as interpretation as the basis for analysis: paraphrases are 'metalinguistic statements' that serve for explanation, explication or redefinition, and all other ways of referring to what has been said (Teubert, 1999). What is said by a speaker in a dialogue or recorded in a text is expected to be 'reinterpreted' (Bakhtin, 1984: 300) in subsequent texts, and therefore results in a new meaning. Meaning is thus viewed as a phenomenon that is always in flux, negotiated and potentially contested.

The emphasis on new meanings created in dialogue is crucial for differentiating the view of a paraphrase adopted in this book from current studies of knowledge extraction in computational linguistics. As discussed in Cheung (2007: 12–15), the natural language processing research into paraphrases includes information retrieval, question answering, text summarisation, and machine translation (the latter relying on parallel or comparable monolingual corpora for automatic paraphrase extraction). Such studies are typically focused on a text that more or less conveys an equivalent meaning of the original, which means that paraphrases are seen as 'alternate verbalizations of the same concept' (Barzilay and Lee, 2002: 167) and 'a set of phrases which express the same thing or event' (Sekine, 2005: 80). Although I discuss and demonstrate how the corpus linguistic software can help us study paraphrases, my analysis is firmly grounded in the qualitative interpretative tradition. For this reason it should be stressed early on that the emphasis is on the variations of meaning achieved through paraphrasing rather than on mere reiteration of content.

The study of meaning of a word, phrase or a text as a phenomenon that is unique is at the heart of a framework for corpus linguistics proposed by Teubert (2005a). According to Teubert, corpus linguistics can help us specify how a written text or segment is positioned within a culture and what it brings to it: 'If we study the discourse as the container of a culture of a community, then we must have the means to specify

what each text or text segment contributes to it. We must be able to make specific claims' (2005a: 13). Such an essentially diachronic view of meaning poses different questions for the agenda of corpus linguistics, as at this stage 'frequency is irrelevant when our goal is to interpret text segments as unique occurrences' (Teubert, 2005a: 6).

When content is reiterated in paraphrase form, its function is not only cohesive, i.e. assimilating the new to the old, but also rhetorical (Karoly, 2002: 98). In other words, writers actively *make* meanings when they draw on the endless variety of intertextual links available to them (Thibault, 1991). Since such production and circulation of texts always take place in the context of culture, certain language practices are valued and given priority, whereas others can be banned and stigmatised. For this reason, Teubert's ideas about paraphrases are viewed in this study though the prism of *recontextualisation,* a concept that features prominently in the works of CDA scholars (Blackledge, 2005; Wodak et al., 1999). In order to take full account of the rhetorical use of paraphrases we must pay attention to how certain forms of knowledge are legitimated over others in specific sociopolitical contexts. Such attention to social actors and circumstances behind text production will bring us closer to the agenda of intertextuality analysis posited by Kristeva, who insists that texts cannot be merely studied as 'sources' since 'all texts … contain within them the ideological structures and struggles expressed in society through discourse' (Kristeva, 1980: 36).

Levels of intertextuality

Let us now discuss how corpus linguistics can assist in the interpretation of meaning through intertextual links. The actual texts which are intertextually present during negotiation in written discourse may be specific, and known. More commonly, however, a text will refer to, draw on and include elements of other texts which are not explicitly present. It is therefore necessary to distinguish between at least two types of intertextuality, specific and non-specific (Blackledge, 2005: 10). Bazerman (2004) goes further and identifies six levels of intertextuality that can be present in texts. These are, on a continuum from the most to the least specific:

1. Prior texts as a source of meaning to be used at face value;
2. 'Explicit social dramas' of prior texts engaged in discussion;
3. Explicit use of other statements as background, support and contrast;
4. Reliance on beliefs, issues, ideas, statements generally circulated and likely familiar to the readers;
5. 'Recognisable kinds of language, phrasing and genre'; and

6. 'Resources of language' or 'available language of the period', in refer-
ence to the cultural world in which a text is produced (Bazerman,
2004: 86–7).

The mechanisms through which these levels can be established range
from a fairly straightforward identification of direct quotations and
markers of attribution to a more interpretative study of 'language and
forms that seem to echo certain ways of communicating, discussions
among other people, types of documents' (ibid.).

Levels 4–6 clearly represent more subtle and more analytically chal-
lenging levels of intertextually which, however, also have the most
potential to significantly enrich the analysis. In this corpus-assisted study
of discourse I suggest that level 4 of non-specific or covert intertextuality
can be marked up by paraphrases of preselected terms as well as by auto-
matically computed keywords. The procedure for studying paraphrases
capitalises on the multifunctionality of the search and concordance func-
tions of the WordSmith software (Scott, 2011), which, inter alia, enables
the analyst to establish how a search term is used with a specific word in
its context, as well as sort the retrieved cotexts of use in different ways.
In particular, corpora in Chapter 6 are searched to bring up co-texts of
the loanwords, which are then manually arranged chronologically to
enable a detailed diachronic analysis. As part of such analysis, it is also
possible to cross-search the corpus for the use of each term in the context
of its most frequent collocates, which would enable analysis of changes
in associations over time.

In line with Bazerman's distinction between statements that can
background, support or 'contrast', paraphrases instantiating intertextual
links can be subdivided into *agreement* and *disagreement* paraphrases.
Whereas *agreement paraphrases,* which build discursive coherence,[2] are
used by writers drawing on texts from their own discourse community
pool, *disagreement paraphrases* are likely to draw on textual recourses
and word uses characteristic of other, competing discourse(s). In other
words, agreement paraphrases represent a dialogue within a discourse
community aimed at elaboration, extension and perpetuation of mean-
ings, whereas disagreement paraphrases reach out to texts of other dis-
course communities in order to subvert, reject or 'displace' (Terdiman,
1985) meanings of catchwords. Whenever meaning of a lexical item
becomes controversial, as is the case with the English loanwords in
Russian media texts, discourse reveals an increased number of agree-
ment and disagreement paraphrases. Examined diachronically, both
types of paraphrases are created through strategies of relexicalisation

and overlexicalisation (Chapter 6). In the case of metaphorical paraphrases, these strategies lead to the development of metaphor scenarios (Mussolf, 2006).

General topics circulated in a subset of discourse encapsulated in one's corpus can be established through keywords,[3] which are typically explored in corpus linguistic studies as indicators of topics or 'aboutness' (Partington, 2003). Thus, keyword analysis undertaken in Chapter 5 reveals unusually frequent lexical items, which are then concordanced to obtain a first glimpse of topics recycled in the pro-Communist discourse community. The 'recognisable kinds of language and phrasing' in level 5 are amenable to analysis through examination of collocational lists that enable us to trace how the circulation of ideas and statements 'likely familiar to the readers' (Bazerman, 2004: 86) relates to our items of interest, that is, loanwords or specific metaphors. Finally, level 6 can only be addressed indirectly during the corpus compilation stage – for example, by selecting texts that constitute a segment of a particular discourse.

2.3 Overall analytical framework

The analytical framework consists of three levels: contextual, textual and intertextual.

Following recent corpus-based studies of genre (Flowerdew, 2005a; Partington, 2010), contextual analysis forms the essential groundwork and informs results derived from other levels of analysis. Here I adopt the context-sensitive model elaborated by the DHA proponents who contextualise utterances in relation to other discourses, social and institutional reference points, as well as political and historical events. In their well-known discussion of context, Drew and Heritage (1992: 7) suggest moving away from Malinowski's deterministic and monolithic view to examine utterances and actions as both 'context shaped' and 'context renewing' (p. 18). Guided by this perspective, the political and historical realities in post-Soviet Russia will be systematically brought in to inform all stages of analysis, starting from corpus compilation and mark-up. The reliance on specialised, contextually informed corpora enhances analysis of individual texts and text segments by providing understanding of their intended audience and the overall purpose ascribed to them by their respective discourse communities.

Despite the primacy of contextual analysis, however, the framework below should not be understood as a sequence of separate operational steps but as a cycle in which the three analytical dimensions listed in Table 2.1 are recursively examined. I will also move back and forth

Table 2.1   The analytical framework

Contextual analysis

Consideration of the roles of the Russian media and political discourses played out in the specific sociocultural context; compilation of specialised, contextually informed corpora:

- – historical context
- – wider sociopolitical context
- – specific context of situation and discourse domain (oppositional newspaper editorials; political speeches and presidential addresses to the nation)

Textual analysis

A study of both content and linguistic means employed within the constraints of different discourses, drawing on DHA and corpus linguistics:

- – the topics (starting point: keywords combined with qualitative analysis of newspaper headlines/speech titles)
- – linguistic means employed to realise discursive strategies of Self and Other presentation (evaluative collocates, metaphors)

Intertextual analysis

An examination of how the authors incorporate internal and outside sources to construct their own texts drawing on Bazerman's analytical framework and Teubert's approach to paraphrases:

- – explicit intertextual links (quotations, acknowledgements of sources)
- – non-explicit intertextual links (paraphrases in media articles, metaphor chains in both types of texts)

---

between manual, interpretive accounts of individual texts to automated computerised analysis of larger amounts of text. For example, a detailed description of paraphrases as part of the intertextual analysis will be combined with the analysis of whole corpora to allow for statements to be made at both micro- and macro-levels.

The textual analysis distinguishes between the following dimensions: the topics which are spoken/written about, the discursive strategies that rely on 'presuppositions that can be seen as a way of strategically "packaging" information' (Chilton, 2004: 64); and the linguistic means that are drawn upon to realise both topics and strategies (Richardson and Wodak, 2009). However, in contrast to DHA practitioners' exclusive reliance on qualitative analysis and close reading to identify these elements, this study uses the corpus linguistic techniques of keywords and collocations to generate preliminary lists of topics and recurrent lexical patterns. After establishing these initial points of entry into the data with the help of computer software, the analysis proceeds to a qualitative stage based on a detailed examination of concordances and

whole texts. In this interpretation of software-generated results, close attention will be paid to newspaper headlines and speech titles, and how recurrent lexical patterns are employed to construct membership of in- and out-groups through the strategies of negative Other and positive Self-presentation.

At the intertextual level, Bazerman's framework for analysing intertextuality and Teubert's corpus linguistic approach to paraphrases are employed to address the following question: how do the authors of given texts (whether media articles or political speeches) recontextualise other texts to support or contrast their own statements? This analysis draws on the dialogical understanding of communication following the works of Russian formalists and their adaptation by the French structuralists and post-structuralists. As a point of departure, it is assumed that texts produced by discourse communities draw on a network of narratives shared by the audience and allowing understanding. Although the concept of the negotiation of meaning applies most clearly to dialogues where speaker and hearer discuss how a particular term is to be understood, here the focus will be on the negotiation of meaning in written texts (Koteyko, 2007). The analysis takes into account the links between texts via both synchronic and diachronic dimensions in order to reveal the spectrum of meanings held in specific discourse communities over time in relation to a lexical item of interest.

A number of studies within the CDA framework have viewed and interrogated intertextuality as a resource used by mainstream discourses to perpetuate hegemony (Fairclough, 1992). On the level of specific intertextuality found in written texts, the study of children's writing by Kamberelis and Scott (1992), for example, has shown how intertextual links point to particular social formations and political ideologies. Blackledge (2005) and Threadgold (1997), on the other hand, engaged predominantly with non-specific, interdiscursive features as they investigated the relation of genres and 'orders of discourse' (Foucault, 1980) within texts. However, few studies have examined how intertextuality works within an oppositional group that tries to subvert power, and how its actors build on existing rhetorical resources in order to develop new counter-meanings.

To address this gap, the intertextual analysis undertaken here draws on the hermeneutic perspective to examine language use in a corpus of oppositional texts. The investigation is expected to be helpful for tracing changes in the connotations of the loanwords, as their meaning is subject to continuous revision by members of this discourse community. Such analysis of paraphrases will bring us closer to historically

situated discourse analysis, as well as enable a documented analysis of meaning change. The interpretations produced by the analyst always remain dynamic and open (Meyer, 2001), with a possibility that new contextual information will produce a new reading. Another researcher may come up with a different interpretation – after all, we should not forget that the term 'intertextuality' was initially employed by the post-structural theorists in their attempt to disrupt the notions of stable meaning (Allen, 2000: 3).

Last but perhaps most important, a disclaimer of my position as a discourse analyst is due. The interpretations offered in the analysis chapters are inseparable from the discourse I am studying, as well as from my own social background. My past life in the Soviet Union and contextual knowledge have enabled certain interpretations but at the same time might well have restricted others, or led me to overlook some aspects of the phenomena I analysed. Despite the aura of objectivity accompanying some corpus linguistic studies, introspection is inevitable in such analyses. Thus, although some of the methods used in this book can be described as automatic due to computerised searches and calculations, my interpretation of resulting patterns and other textual evidence remains pivotal to this enquiry. At the same time, the comparative and intertextual analyses can be evaluated against the criteria I have discussed. A strict objectivity can never be achieved in the corpus-assisted analysis elaborated here, as much as in any other form of enquiry, but the researcher can detail the analytical steps taken and reflect on difficulties, contradictions and 'blind alleys' inevitably encountered along the way.

3
Sociolinguistic Patterns and Discursive Stages in Post-Soviet Russia

The first part of this chapter provides an overview of sociolinguistic changes that took place in the post-perestroika period. It outlines such developments as the instability of the boundaries between centre and periphery of the Russian language system, reflected in the move of previously marginally used words to the centre, the marginalisation of words that had been in common use, as well as a strong influx of loanwords and 'internal' loans from various non-standard varieties of Russian. While such typologies are valuable in their own right, it is argued that attention to the stylistic and pragmatic uses of borrowed words can deliver additional insights into the change of culture and ideology. Two specific elements essential to such analysis, namely the concepts of 'word meaning' and 'metaphor', are discussed next. Drawing on the vast body of work in discourse analysis and political communication, I demonstrate how these concepts are crucial for exploring the theme of legitimisation and identity construction in Russian media texts and political speeches. The choice of metaphors can frame and organise our shared political narratives, whereas word meanings in particular domains can be redefined as part of a discursive struggle. From this perspective, a systematic study of these textual elements enables the analyst to explore the connections between language and social change.

The second part attempts to relate the above broad linguistic trends to parallel sociopolitical shifts. On the one hand, events of the early 1990s signalled a break with the long-standing and unitary Soviet discourse and necessitated a search for a new national identity and different means of expression. On the other hand, as borne out by the work of social and political scientists, allusions to the Soviet past continued to permeate Russian public discourses well into the next century – in the form of what has been dubbed a 'Soviet nostalgia' (White, 2010) with its

31

various discursive instantiations. The aim is to account for some of these contradictory tendencies and their linguistic manifestations by situating Russian post-Soviet discourse within the theory of symbolic capital.

3.1   Internal and external shifts

During the first turbulent post-Soviet decade, rapid changes in political and social life were accompanied by dramatic shifts on the sociolinguistic landscape. The early 1990s is a relatively well-studied period in post-Soviet linguistic history (Dulichenko, 1994; Kostomarov, 1994, 1997, 2005; Zybatow, 1995; Timofeeva, 1995; Zemskaya, 1996; Shaposhnikov, 1998; Ryazanova-Clarke and Wade, 1999; Krysin, 2000, 2004; Kostomarov and Burvikova, 2001). Although focused on the description of changes on the linguistic plane rather than undertaking a critical and contextualised approach to discourse analysis, these studies provide an important historical overview of the main sociolinguistic trends during this period and therefore are briefly reviewed below.

Following the policy of glasnost, an intensive process of naming and renaming of the new sociopolitical realities began, accompanied by the questioning of previous ideological concepts. Words used to describe socialist experiences became redundant, and street and institution names coined from the Communist 'newspeak' had to be changed. Several patterns were documented in the Russian language during this period, characterised, in the words of Ryazanova-Clarke and Wade (1999), 'by an increased instability of the boundaries between centre and periphery of the language system' (1999: 75). What had previously been rare or obsolete lexis now moved to the centre of the language system, whereas, conversely, the use of once popular words became marginalised. The boundaries between different spheres of speech that were strictly regulated during the Soviet period suddenly became malleable, following the abolition of censorship in official discourse.

A group of words considered to be 'peripheral' during the Communist period includes historicisms, loanwords, as well as 'native' lexemes referring to foreign, as opposed to Soviet, realia. Russian linguists (e.g. Krysin, 1996; 2004; Kostomarov, 1997) point to the activation of lexical items that were previously considered obsolete in such spheres as religion and culture, as well as a reactivation of the pre-Soviet lexis of business and the economy, as became evident from an increasing popularity of such words as, for example, *акция* (share) or *банкротство* (bankruptcy). Having been out of circulation for some time, such words can be classified as 'functional' neologisms, highlighting the fact that their novelty is conditional, relative (see Chapter 4).

A so-called 'gangster language' was another example of a previously marginalised subset of the Russian lexis that became widely used during this time. Mostly comprised of criminal and commercial argots, this vocabulary set included such lexical items as *крыша* (a roof), for example, denoting an authority offering protection to business owners in exchange for money, that is a protection racket. Although the crime metaphor is not an unusual phenomenon in Russian political speech and thought, and was occasionally used by the Soviet press to describe the political 'Other', during this period its frequency of use far exceeded that of Soviet times, which made Chudinov remark that every single politician and journalist cannot help but use such metaphors or 'at least criminal argot' (2001: 95).

Another major trend in the transformation of the Russian lexicon widely documented in the linguistic literature is the influx of loanwords. Intensive borrowing[1] from other languages is not an unprecedented event in the history of the Russian language: before the Gorbachev era, the Peter the Great epoch and the time after the October Revolution were known as periods of borrowing to designate new sociopolitical phenomena. Following perestroika as well as general expansion of English as a world language, numerous loanwords[2] entered Russian through pop culture, advertising, technological spheres and media language (Kostomarov, 1997). The loanwords chosen to illustrate the corpus-assisted discourse analysis in this study belong to the specialised sphere of business and economics. The beginning of market reforms in Russia heralded a new dawn in the use of this type of lexis, as the sphere of the economy became characterised by one of the highest rates of borrowing from English (Krysin, 1996; Korten, 1999).

3.2 Studying linguistic changes in discourse

Stylistic and pragmatic functions of borrowings

Assimilation of loanwords in the recipient language is a complex process that varies from one loanword to another depending on the time and purpose of borrowing. Conventionally, the process is divided into two stages: the stage of penetration and that of integration, exemplified in relation to the degree of social acceptance. The stage of penetration marks the beginning of a relatively frequent use of loanwords, when they become visible in several discursive spheres. It is still not known whether they will be included in the system of the recipient language, or end up in limited lexicographic editions. Such uses are accompanied by commentaries that include notes about etymology or source language definitions. The stage of integration marks a period of more

frequent usage accompanied by new meanings – both literary and meta-phoric ones, which do not exist in the source language. This process is also characterised by morphological assimilation, when loanwords take part in word formation. At this stage, loanwords are only occasionally used with short commentaries and are normally understood by the majority of native speakers without the need for further explanation.

The notion of partial assimilation brings us to the function of loan-words in discourse conceptualised as the interplay between language, ideology, and social practice. There have been a number of attempts to classify the functions that loanwords can be employed to perform in the recipient language, and results of such classifications vary with the author (see e.g. Kristensson (1977) and Pfitzner (1978 for English borrowings in German; and Jucker (1996) for both German words in English and Anglicisms in German). Many of these studies, however, tend to focus on external factors behind borrowing, such as the time of upheaval when words are borrowed to fill in a lexical gap, for example. This is usually followed by a description of the necessity to describe new things and phenomena as the main reason for using a loanword. From this perspective, we can view the frequent use of loanwords in Russian as conditioned by the transition 'from plan to market' together with the overall technological progress to fill in the lexical gaps (Ustinova and Bhatia, 2005). In this sense, the use of such loanwords as *manager, infla-tion, distribution* and *investment* is purely terminological.

Much less research has been done on stylistic and pragmatic functions of loanwords in general (Rodríguez González, 1996) and Anglicisms in Russian in particular (but see Krysin, 2004; Ryazanova-Clarke and Wade, 1999). During the process of assimilation, loanwords can develop meanings which they do not have, and may have never had, in their source language. Such newly acquired connotations can then start to be used for various stylistic purposes in discourse. Consider the borrow-ing *пиар*, a Russian spelling of PR (public relations), a popular word in Russian which, however, is used mainly in a negative sense. Although the loanword denotes a concept that does not exist in the recipient language its use is not always purely instrumental. Another limiting feature of existing stylistically oriented analyses of borrowed lexis is a focus on the meta-communicative purpose, that is the tendency to express evaluation of the elements of foreign culture that loanwords convey (Rodríguez González, 1996). In such cases, loanwords are treated as symbols of a foreign culture and assumed to be used to underline good or bad features of the foreign. Such observations have been made with regard to the use of English loanwords in Russian, when they are

classified as a type of 'prestige borrowing' (Krysin, 2004; Ustinova and Bhatia, 2005).

The analyses presented further in this book start from the assumption that the integration stage presents a new host of challenges and opportunities for linguistic and discursive description, as meanings developed by loanwords are not necessarily limited to their culture of origin, but can include evaluation of 'insider' phenomena and processes. To arrive at the peculiarities of such uses, one must necessarily take into account the sociopolitical background conditioning the emergence of new meanings. Within the framework of corpus-assisted discourse analysis outlined earlier, language choice is seen as political strategy and the use of loanwords as always potentially ideological. It follows from this then, that to understand the role and significance of loanwords as linguistic innovations we need to understand not only their distribution and the external factors leading to their borrowing, but (1) the ways the recipient community assigns value to objects and processes; and (2) the forms of control over discourse and discourse production characterising the recipient culture. Borrowing is therefore seen here as an intercultural process, in the course of which semantic properties of a lexical item are adopted and, at the same time, adapted to the network of host associations.

The borrowing in the post-Soviet period occurred in the circumstances of regime change, increasing the likelihood that loanwords would adopt a role similar to that of political keywords, a strange concept for the former totalitarian society. One of the defining characteristics for ideological keywords (Williams, 1983) is that they embody facts of history, and become the nodes around which ideological battles are fought. Consequently, they tend to be well documented by explicit linguistic commentaries in the mass media (Stubbs, 1998). Indeed, the significant popularity of business-related loans in Russian media discourse has earned them qualification for inclusion in the list of keywords characterising the 'transition' epoch of the 1990s in Russian sociolinguistics (Krysin, 2004). Analysis of stylistic and pragmatic functions of such words can reveal how they are used to emphasise or de-emphasise a political stance, engender support and understanding, or legitimate a course of action. Out of the vast array of categories employed by critical linguists to study such processes, in this book I focus on connotation and metaphor.

Connotations and evaluative meaning

Lexical choice and variation are a key area in the critical analysis of texts. Studies in the well-established tradition of political communication

have highlighted the fact that politicians have a preference for a specific set of words and word combinations (Hermanns, 1994; Schaffner, 1997). In parallel, content analytical approaches in media studies have revealed how political bias can be enacted through use of words and norms of coverage (Glasgow University Media Group, 1976, 1980). A common feature of such studies is attention to connotations because of their potential to foreground certain meanings and express emotions, and in this way act as an implicit contributor to persuasive strategies.

The term 'connotation', however, is not unambiguous and has been variously defined by linguists. Connotation is referred to as affective, associative, emotive and attitudinal meaning and is often contrasted with denotation – logical, cognitive, conceptual as well as 'central' or 'core' meaning of a lexical unit. Lyons (1977: 176), for example, defines connotation as 'an emotive or affective component additional to its central meaning', whereas according to Backhouse (1992) the term is applied to 'various aspects of the communicative value of linguistic units which are seen as lying outside the core meaning' (1992: 297). Backhouse (1992: 297) further distinguishes between social, cultural and expressive types of connotation. The cultural component is commonly discussed through a cross-linguistic comparison of translation equivalents, such as connotations of British English *summer* and Japanese *natsu* (1992: 298). Both words denote the warmest part of the year but their cultural associations differ because for Japanese *natsu* carries connotations of an intolerable heat. As an expressive component of meaning, connotation is seen as a realisation of favourable or unfavourable judgement (also referred to as evaluative[3] meaning).

The term sometimes stands for personal associations triggered in the minds of interlocutors and is thus considered to be implicit and idiosyncratic. Although this study cannot escape dealing with conceptual content and knowledge of previous word uses, the focus remains on the textual level, according to which lexico-grammatical relations within a particular discourse type should be revealing for establishing meanings of lexical items (see also Philip, 2011). In addition, it is argued that the study of connotation can be enhanced through intertextual analysis enabled by a principled selection of texts in a corpus, and a broader definition of context in terms of a sociopolitical background.

Taking into account the various phenomena that the term 'connotation' may stand for, we need a term that would point to shared assumptions and norms of usage reflected in the meaning of a lexical item. The term 'deontic meaning' or rather 'deontic component of meaning' introduced by Hermanns (1994) is a suitable candidate. *Deontic* is the

term borrowed from logic and used to describe a part of the lexical meaning that implies something one should or should not do or have (Hermanns, 1994). Whereas in logic it refers only to ethical values, Teubert (2005b) also uses the term to point to desirability or undesirability. Such ethical and moral values, in Saussure's terms, 'owe their existence solely to usage and general acceptance' (Saussure, 1974: 112). Philip (2011) makes a similar point, drawing on the Gricean distinction between meaning as belief and meaning as event: 'Negatively-evaluated words are not negative in terms of their informational, denotative meaning, but refer to real-world phenomena which are viewed negatively within the language community' (2011: 62). Therefore, each word can potentially be used to express different values. In this respect, Voloshinov (2000) puts forward the notion of *multi-accentuality* according to which all signs can have their potential 'accented', or directed towards a particular kind of meaning. When a word is repeatedly used with a particular accent, it bears associations with a particular ideological position and its deontic meaning is developed.

Deontic meaning is close to the concept of socially or culturally motivated evaluation. As Channell (2000) explains, taking the word *fat* as an example:

> … the data shows us a concrete evidence for something which everyone living within a British cultural framework takes for granted, that for a person to be fat is to be unattractive or bad. This is of course not true of other cultures. So *fat* provides an example of a culturally agreed or culturally motivated evaluation, which depends on shared values within the culture. (Channell, 2000: 43)

We may talk about the deontic meaning of a word or expression if we position it within culture on the whole as in Channell's example with the word *fat*. But the term 'deontic' can also be applied to a normative potential that a word acquires in discourse of a particular social group. This makes the term useful in the discussion of contrastive evaluations of the same phenomenon by discourse communities that have different political orientations. Supplying their own definitions and explanations, contending social forces may attempt to make 'a multi-accentual' word intrinsically 'uni-accentual', by giving it negative or positive evaluation (Hartley, 1982). Words with deontic meaning therefore constitute an essential part of the strategies of positive Self-representation and negative Other-presentations studied by CDA scholars.

In this regard, Strauß et al. (1989: 39) develop Hermann's work on words with deontic meaning by classifying words in politics into *Fahnen-, Kampf* and *Feindwörter*, that is words used to make friends or enemies, and words employed in political contest about ideas. Such words are defined in terms of their opinion-forming character, their ability to generalise and their emotive appeal. They are ideologically marked, value-oriented and linked to interests of specific social groups. Positively loaded words (*Fahnenwörter*) express core, basic values whereas *Feindwörter* or *Stigmawörter* are used to evoke negative associations attached to the objects or concepts they denote. Both types of words, positive and negative, function as *Kampfwörter*, literally 'contest words', because they are employed to express support for or rejection of certain values. A similar notion of 'ideologeme' was developed in Russian sociolinguistics (e.g. Kupina, 1995; Guseinov, 2004) following the work of the Bakhtin school.

Metaphors

Defined as 'understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another' (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 5), metaphor involves a mapping of semantic features from a source to target domain. It is now widely recognised that metaphors are far more than a mere ornament to language, and can be employed persuasively and strategically across a range of discourses, whether those of politics (Chilton, 2004; Charteris-Black, 2005), media (Nerlich and Clarke, 2003; Nerlich and Koteyko, 2009) or public health (Segal, 1997). As a cognitive phenomenon realised in language through metaphoric expressions, metaphor use can shape our thinking and therefore can be studied to uncover the workings of persuasion. This rhetorical and ideological role of metaphor, stemming from the semantic process of substitution, is both subtle and pervasive. However, as Hart (2008) observes, until recently the majority of CDA studies have paid attention to grammatical features such as agentless passive constructions and nominalisations on the one hand, and argumentative elements such as topoi on the other, whereas metaphors have been 'largely neglected' (p. 96).

Following the Lakoffian school, conceptual metaphors have been used to explore 'cognitive and emotional mechanisms which come into play in the construction of the individual as well as collective mind' (Vannoni, 2001 cited in Ferrari, 2007: 610; Lakoff, 2004). At the same time, there has been an increasing awareness that the study of linguistic phenomena needs to be based on authentic language usage, not least because the theoretical assumptions behind the conceptual metaphor theory approach are not easily rendered into analytical tools on a textual level.

More recent analyses have therefore foregrounded the importance of a discourse-centred investigation of figurative expressions (Mussolf and Zinken, 2009), particularly in political language where the deployment of cultural conceptual models is crucial (Chilton, 2004; Charteris-Black, 2004, 2005). In such studies, metaphors are identified and analysed consistently across texts, with a focus on how they are encoded in different lexical items and embedded in different contexts. Here the term 'discourse metaphors' is proposed – to refer to metaphors that are conceptually grounded but whose meaning can also be shaped by their use at a given time and in the context of a debate about a certain topic (Zinken et al., 2008). The source concepts of discourse metaphors occupy an important place in cultural imagination, which, in turn, allows their users to highlight salient aspects of a socially, culturally or politically relevant topic (Nerlich and Koteyko, 2009).

In contrast to stable conceptual metaphors, metaphors of this type can change and evolve in discourse (Hellsten, 2000) as they are used to structure and frame our social narratives (Koteyko et al., 2008a). Attention to this role of metaphors therefore resonates with the frame analysis approach in media studies, where frames are explored as cultural tools shared by journalists and audience members to create and interpret meaning in context (Schön and Rein, 1994; Koteyko, 2012). In a similar vein, Wodak talks about 'cognitive frames' or 'heuristic metaphors' (2006: 181), emphasising how they function to enable us to discover explanations for issues in question. Charteris-Black (2009) highlights this explanatory role of metaphors by referring to their mythic dimension. Drawing on Barthes (1993), he sees myths as 'explanatory narratives' that would vary according to specific psychological and social conditions. Heavily based on metaphors and other symbols, myths provide representation of 'intangible but evocative experiences that are unconsciously linked to emotions such as sadness, happiness and fear' (Charteris-Black, 2009: 100) and therefore constitute a crucial element of Bourdieu's 'symbolic power'. The times of political instability and economic hardship, such as the post-perestroika period in Russia,[4] often invite metaphor-laden political explanations for the causes of social evils.

Because of their emotionality, metaphors can reflect a certain stance, and as such they deserve attention from both discourse analysts and corpus linguists. As Cameron and Deignan observe, metaphors are used to express 'affect and attitude along with ideational content' (2006: 676). This evaluative role of metaphors makes them another powerful and popular legitimation device to achieve positive Self-presentation and

negative Other-presentation. Metaphorical meanings that derive from conceptual fields with positive associations can be used to describe our people and our actions, whereas negative metaphoric traits will be ascribed to opponents.

Not only pervasive but also systematic and operating in chains (Koller, 2003), metaphors can indeed 'contribute to a situation where they privilege one understanding of reality over others' (Chilton, 1996: 74). This pragmatic aspect of metaphor use is of particular importance for analyses presented later in this book, which examine how the productive conceptual domains of crime, building and journey were adopted in different political narratives to achieve culturally and historically specific purposes. In particular, I demonstrate how Putin's use of path and building metaphors serves his primary rhetorical objective to create what Charteris-Black (2007: 76) calls a 'valiant leader myth', according to which his actions are represented as forces of good and stability in contrast to his predecessor's forces of 'destruction'.

3.3   Discursive stages

From heresy to orthodoxy

A corpus-assisted discourse analysis of texts from the post-Soviet period requires attention to at least two issues relating to the sociopolitical context. The first has to do with the discursive legacy of the Soviet past or, going back to Bakhtin, the memory that words or phrases have about their previous contexts of use. Lunde and Roesen (2006: 10) reflect on language use in post-Soviet public and literary discourse: 'A critical stance, for example, can often be shown to advance a double agenda, questioning not only contemporary linguistic usage, but also challenging, or even deconstructing, the totalitarian language of the recent past.' The second, and related, issue concerns the post-Soviet context itself, which was characterised by radical sociopolitical upheaval and instability in the first decade, and relative economic stabilisation during later years. As pointed out by political scientists (March, 2002; Okara, 2007), such underlying dynamics inevitably eschews a straightforward categorisation of the post-Soviet years in terms of unitary political or ideological tendencies. A more profitable approach in terms of discourse analysis is therefore to relate language use to the dynamics between discursive stability and change as espoused in the works of Bourdieu.

Of particular importance to the analysis of post-Soviet discourse is Bourdieu's tripartite model of discourse consisting of doxa, orthodoxy and heterodoxy. The category of doxa, adopted from Husserl's

phenomenology, includes taken for granted presuppositions about the world, something that goes without saying. In contrast to doxa as something that is not debatable, the realm of opinion is divided into two notions: orthodoxy and heterodoxy. Orthodoxy is opinion in favour of the status quo aimed at restoring previous conventions and tacit beliefs. In other words, orthodoxy is striving to preserve the current state of habitus, the accepted aspect of social practice. Heterodoxy is the opposite, an opinion contesting the rigidity of orthodoxy and also presenting the possibility of drawing elements of doxa into the universe of discourse, and therefore making something an object of debate (1977: 164–9). Such a framework is bound to be illuminating in the analysis of the fluid and transient nature of the post-Soviet discursive landscape, and has been insightfully applied to analyse the discursive construction of national days in Russia between 1992 and 2007 by Ryazanova-Clarke (2008a).

Ryazanova-Clarke (2008a) discusses both the broader discursive processes and the specifics of meaning-making practices during the sociopolitically turbulent decades in Russian history by employing the theoretical lens of heretical and orthodox discourses vying for legitimacy. Drawing on Bourdieu's writings on the symbolic and linguistic capital, the scholar suggests viewing Russian discursive processes 'within the framework of the dynamics of freedom and constraint, the negotiation of the doxa, and the contest between heretical, or heterodox, and orthodox discourses' (2008a: 224). From this perspective, the post-perestroika public discourse corresponds to the *heretic break* with the established order, which also includes a departure from the existing language dispositions:

> The breakdown of the Soviet symbolic order was a paradoxical and extraordinary social situation which called for an extraordinary kind of discourse and, accompanied by cognitive subversion, for a new kind of knowledge, shaped by that discourse. Bourdieu's notion of heretical discourse is useful here: having the task of challenging the doxa and producing a new 'common sense', it was responsible, in the Russian context, for the re-formation of mental structures and for the production of new, different means of expression, such as rhetorical devices and legitimate styles, endowing them with the status of authoritative tools. (Ryazanova-Clarke, 2008a: 225)

Drawing on the analysis of media narratives dealing with Victory Day celebrations, this study maps the various post-Soviet discourses according to already delineated periods of Russian political life, such as the

presidencies of Boris Yeltsin (period 1), and Vladimir Putin (periods 2 and 3 corresponding to early and middle Putin, whereas period 4 is related to the final years of Putin's second presidential term). The first period is characterised by discontinuity and heterogeneity, while the other three stages display an increasing preference for authoritarian or 'orthodox' discourse. Zassoursky's description of Russia's media-political history (see Chapter 1) broadly echoes this categorisation, although the author distinguishes between the early Yeltsin period characterised by 'chaotic, disintegrating social reality' and political decentralisation, and the later 1996–2000 period when media holdings functioned 'as political parties' and the media political system was in full swing (2004: 20–3). Adopting this categorisation for the purposes of my investigation, it will be assumed that three broad discursive stages can be (albeit only loosely) mapped onto sociopolitical transformations during the following periods: 1991–96 (early Yeltsin period), 1996–99 (late Yeltsin period) and 2000–8 (Putin's two terms in office). The periods are not clear-cut and the dates should be seen only as an approximate guide to the shifts on the discursive plane.

1991–96: the heretic break

The Soviet discourse of political documents and media texts was highly citational, ritualistic and often thematically predetermined which made the role of the author minimal (Rathmayer, 1991). Kondakov (1941, cited in Yurchak 2003: 487) provides an example of a practical reference book issued in 1941:

> Language is a tool of development and struggle. ... With the help of that tool the Party arms the toilers with its great ideas that inspire one to struggle for the cause of Communism. ... Language, as any tool, needs to be perfected, polished, and carefully protected from whatever kind of contamination and slightest spoil.

Any signs of authorial creativity or simply the use of unusual words in official journals were seen as 'deviation from the norm' and therefore carefully edited out as *литературщина* [literariness] (Yurchak, 2003: 490). This Soviet discourse was a uniform, self-evident and legitimate phenomenon beyond question for Russian people, that is, the doxa in Bourdieu's terminology.

Following Bourdieu, we can speculate that the heretic break from this established order will be manifested through re-emergence of previously repressed practices, including discursive practices marginalised during

the orthodoxy of the Communist regime. According to Ryazanova-Clarke (2008a), this trend was visible on the Russian linguistic landscape through the processes of de-tabooisation of previously illegitimate language, including the above-mentioned tendencies to use criminal slang and vulgar language (Khimik, 2000; Mokienko, 1999), but also high registers such as religious lexis and ecclesiastical styles. In this context, the use of colloqualisms and slang in public discourse contrasted sharply with the previous highly formulaic discourse, and frequent substitution of Russian words with borrowed lexis constituted a celebration of a new version of language 'untarnished' by the past (Kostomarov, 1994: 38). This new version of language became one of the key features of heterodoxy, a creative tool exercised in heretic discourses throughout the 1990s.

The use of loanwords, symbolising a new way of life and new social relations, became one of the main characteristics of the post-perestroika heretic break. First, new and unfamiliar loanwords were frequently used alongside and instead of existing Russian equivalents, which later led to observations about their 'unjustified' use (Krysin, 1996) and speculations that words of English origin were considered to be more socially prestigious. In this context, Krysin (1996) talks about the use of foreign loans instead of traditional lexical items in terms of 'status upgrading' (p. 153), discussing the example of the business term *консалтинг* (consulting) which was considered to be of a higher quality than the Russian word *консультация*. Second, existing loans referring to previously denounced practices such as entrepreneurship, which connoted negative values in Soviet discourse, now became used either as neutral semi-technical terms, or in contexts signalling positive evaluation. The dictionary notes 'derog', 'in capitalist countries' or 'in bourgeoisie society' were shed.

The stylistic liberation was also marked by (often excessive) use of humour and irony in public discourse and media texts in particular. As Zemskaya (1996) commented: 'Never before was irony found on the first – official – page, but now it settled even there' (p. 156). Newspapers across the spectrum from serious to tabloid resorted to playful and ironic accounts of events, making Zemskaya remark that the tendency was 'pandemic' or, in the eyes of another observer, post-Soviet Russia was 'sizzle[ing] with irony' (Neidhart, 2003: 216).

1996–99: Heretic discourses

Heretic discourses that ruptured the formulaic public discourse of Soviet times could be traced in different media, documents and informal talk

towards the end of the 1990s. As outlined in Chapter 1, the period after the 1996 presidential election was characterised by 'media wars' which followed the rules of 'kompromat' or 'black PR' and used language permeated by criminal slang. Ryazanova-Clarke (2005: 144), for example, found that criminal metaphor was 'a systematic and coherent method of expression across political discourse and even the discourse of the sociocultural community', with metaphorical expressions used in newspapers, political interviews and parliamentary debates. In Chapter 6 of this book, we will see how crime metaphors and criminal argot served as one of the favourite tools of counter-discourses in this period, whereas after 2000, criminal rhetoric also features in presidential talk (Goscilo, 2012).

Chudinov (2001) lists the following metaphors recurrently used in Russian political discourse during this time: crime metaphor, military metaphor, theatre and metaphors of game and sport. The conceptual metaphor [modern] RUSSIA IS A CRIMINAL SOCIETY in particular became a dominant model in political language. The metaphor renders Russian reality as a place of criminality, a place where there is ever-expanding influence of the criminal world, and where a crime is the only means to reach justice or simply to survive (2001: 95). The use of this metaphor was therefore characterised by a high level of productivity as well as a high level of specialisation within the domain. Chudinov presents the following classification of the main domains:

1. Criminals and their specialisations. Russian citizens are constantly referred to metaphorically (that is 'without any legal basis', p. 96) as гангстеры (gangsters), бандиты (bandits), рэкетиры (racketeers), киллеры (contract killers), воры (thieves), or шулеры (card-sharps).
2. Criminal gangs, societies and their structures. This includes hierarchical relations such as пахан (head of gang), авторитет (respected member, English slang: 'don'); подельник (accomplice); крестный отец (godfather).
3. Criminals and their 'professional' activities. These roles are frequently occupied by government officials, and the activities include killing, rape, plundering, racketeering and stealing.
4. Victims of criminals, such as лох (hustler's victim).
5. Relationships within or between criminal groups: жить по понятиям (to obey the criminal code of behaviour), разборка (gang warfare, bust-up), наезд (physical pressure, strong-arm tactics), кидать (to deceive, to set up), and so on (for further examples and discussion, see Ryazanova-Clarke, 2005: 145).

Crime metaphors were not the only discursive means of Other-presentation in this period. By this time the majority of loanwords borrowed at the beginning of the 1990s had already passed the stage of penetration and moved into the stage of integration, turning into a sophisticated instrument to express a break from established norms of language use. There are several mutually constituting factors pointing to the integration of business loanwords in particular. First, these loans appear to be frequently used in the newspapers of the period. For example, a quick scan of a one-month issue of the daily newspaper *Московский Комсомолец* (November 1999) revealed that the word *бизнес* (business) occurred 23 times, *бизнесмен* (businessman) 15 times, *менеджер* (manager) 21 times, *дефолт* (default) 10 times, *офис* (office) 14 times, etc. Second, there is evidence of graphical and morphological integration. The frequent usage led to the predominant transliteration of loanwords, in contrast to the previous citation with original Latin spelling. At the same time, loanwords appear to take part in word formation on the basis of suffixation and prefixation. For example, we can observe the derivation of adjectives from nouns in the case of *privatisation* and *voucher: приватизация – приватизационный, ваучер – ваучерный.*

As a long time span is needed for a word to integrate into a language, the post-perestroika loans were still alienated from the rest of 'native' lexemes. This lack of assimilation and connotations of foreignness, evidenced in pronunciation, spelling or word structure, became exploited in political discourses to achieve a variety of stylistic and pragmatic functions. Furthermore, during this period we can identify signs of semantic adaptation as these borrowed items start acquiring new shades of meaning. This trend is attested by Kostomarov (1997) who, in his study of lexis used in the 1990s, observes a tendency for loanwords to 'get completely new meanings' (1997: 113). In such instances, it is possible to talk about loanwords as important tools in the arsenal of heretic discourses.

At the same time, the shifts on the political and media landscape towards the end of this period could be seen as precursors of the attempts to harness the heretic. Such attempts first became visible soon after the 1996 election, and crystallised by 2000 when former party officials, together with former state officials, constituted a majority in the Russian parliament (Hahn, 2002). Not surprisingly, many political observers describe the collective identity of Russian society at the end of the 1990s as 'stabilisation', talking about a déjà vu (back to Brezhnev times) when the media promoted an average world view with little choice (Dubin, 2005). During this time language use, and the use of

loanwords in particular, started to show the first signs of orthodox tendencies, mostly evident through discourses centred on explicit negotiation of language norms. One could observe, for example, first attempts to delineate 'acceptable' usage and articulate new norms (Lunde and Roesen, 2006). Around 1999–2001, the metalinguistic trends surrounding the issues of language legislation and regulation began to dominate Russian public discourse, with purist tendencies coming to the fore (Gorham, 2006).

2000–7: 'Harnessing the heretic'

In Pierre Bourdieu's theory, the triumph of the heretic is followed by a period of struggle between the discourses of heterodoxy and orthodoxy for symbolic capital, delineating and delimiting knowledge of the social world (Ryazanova-Clarke, 2008a). In the competition between different sets of knowledge, the orthodox discourse performs a reactionary function, attempting to restore doxic relations to the social world. The creative force of heretical break is met by the resistant force of orthodoxy.

The resignation of Yelstin in December 1999 followed by the appointment of Vladimir Putin as the acting president of Russia can be seen as a political precursor of such doxic restoration. Combining the 'strong hand' government with liberal economic policies as a means of economic revival, Putin instituted a pro-Western foreign policy and declared an overall 'modernisation' of Russia in accordance with Western standards. However, the intention to modernise Russia expressed in his speeches was not realised in his political actions, which demonstrated a deep distrust of democratic institutions (Shevtsova, 2003, 2007a; White, 2010). On the level of domestic policy, for example, the orthodox tendency was formulated as the goal of restoring the 'vertical of power' and establishing law and order, as the opposite to the chaotic realities of the Boris Yeltsin era. For business tycoons, this translated into the distancing of business from the state. The abolition of gubernatorial elections in 2004, when directly elected governors were replaced with Putin's appointees, can be seen as the culmination of this process. A related trend was observed on the media landscape (Chapter 1), where state-controlled but commercially driven media were fostering depoliticisation of society through a constant supply of 'infotainment' (Dubin, 2005).

Language policy was not an exception. In the early 2000s, the former Ministry for the Press, Radio Broadcasting and the Mass Media funded a series of radio programmes dedicated to language cultivation (Ryazanova-Clarke, 2008c). The programmes broadcast on such stations as Ekho Moskvy and Mayak Radio instructed their listeners how to speak

Russian correctly (focusing in particular on the role of foreignisms) and acquired the role of gatekeepers of 'good Russian' (ibid.). In June 2005, the state unambiguously declared its policy by regulating the use of foreignisms in a chapter in the Law on Russian as the State Language of the Russian Federation. As restoration of doxa is presented through the order of the linguistic norm (Bourdieu, 1977), these attempts to establish 'pure' and 'authorised' language can be seen as clear indicators of increasing orthodoxy.

The orthodox properties of this discursive trend are also salient in Putin's statements, annual state of the nation addresses to parliament, and media interviews. The analysis of Putin's speeches in Chapter 7, for example, reveals a strategic deployment of metaphors evoking the Soviet past. Together with pronouncements and deliberations by government officials and members of the presidential team, such documents are important for analysing how the 'discourse of authority' was developed during this period. Such phrases as 'managed democracy', 'restoring the vertical of power', 'construction of an efficient state' and 'rebuilding the nation' are only some of the examples instantiating this trend. Later on, a speech by Vladislav Surkov, a senior Kremlin aide, made on 7 February 2006 to students of United Russia's Centre for Party Personnel Training expanded on another key notion: 'sovereign democracy' (Okara, 2007).

Orthodox tendencies have already been examined by discourse analysts and political scientists (Ryazanova-Clarke, 2008a, b; Maslennikova, 2009; Fruchtmann, 2004b; Kryshtanovskaya and White, 2003). As a contribution to this research, further in this book I analyse linguistic practices of the mainstream and oppositional discourses, paying particular attention to the deployment of orthodoxy and heterodoxy through borrowed lexis and various metaphors. The semantics of selected loanwords, their surrounding lexis and grammatical patterns, are first examined to provide insights into the relational aspect of meaning (Saussure, 1974) on the synchronic plane. The manifold discourse realisations of the loanwords including the accompanying use of metaphors are then studied through paraphrases to shed light on changes in connotations. The corpus-assisted analysis of Putin's speeches takes a similar form. Given the fact that many metaphors are naturalised and therefore attract collocates as any other lexical item, metaphor use is amenable to corpus linguistic analysis focused on lexico-grammatical patterning (Cameron and Deignan, 2003). These analyses would not detect individual connotations and subjective resonance of metaphors, but are a good starting point for identifying their 'public resonance' (Philip, 2011: 63).

4
Compilation of Specialised Corpora

The chapter discusses key considerations in the compilation and management of corpora employed in this study. The following aspects are covered: the make-up of the corpora in terms of genres or discourse types, methods of data collection and processing, preparation and size. To address a concern that the use of corpus linguistic techniques in discourse analysis can lead to a loss of meaning and decontextualised results, I also discuss the advantages of compiling and analysing specialised corpora.

4.1   Key terms and procedures

A corpus is often defined as a 'body' or collection of texts. Its function varies depending on the aims of a linguistic project: a corpus can serve as a source of frequency information for dictionary entries or as a database of examples of attested language use in advanced foreign language learning. While corpora in general may comprise written, spoken or a combination of different text types, analyses in this book are based on corpora compiled exclusively from written sources. With the advent of the Internet era it became possible to obtain instant access to a variety of text types, which created new favourable conditions for compiling large collections of texts in a short amount of time. The availability of online data allows for the building of more diverse corpora, and the making of more generalisable statements about patterns discovered in them. However, web-based data also present specific challenges in terms of collection and documentation. Two common problems with material sourced from the Internet are the lack or complete absence of information about the source and the unstable nature of the data. The texts available for analysis today may be removed without warning

tomorrow, jeopardising replicability as a result (Mautner, 2005; Koteyko, 2010). For this reason, newspaper texts and political speeches produced and/or stored in online repositories are usually a more reliable source for compiling corpora than other types of online data.

Although any collection of more than one text can be called a corpus, the term itself has a number of more specific connotations in corpus linguistics; for example: that it is machine readable, representative and has a finite size (Sinclair, 1991). The importance of creating a representative body of language data for analysis is stressed by Renouf (1987), who maintains that 'the first step towards achieving this aim is to define the whole of which the corpus is to be a sample' (1987: 2; see also Biber, 1993). Here the corpus design is a factor in the replicability of the analysis (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001).

The terminology used for the description of corpora make-up is not consistent. The terms 'genre' and 'register' are often used interchangeably mainly because they overlap to some degree. One difference between the two terms lies in their relation to contextual parameters of text production. *Genre* tends to be associated with the sociocultural aspects of language (Swales, 1990) whereas *register* is linked with the organisation of situation or immediate context, particularly in systemic functional linguistics (SFL) (Halliday, 1978). Genres can vary across cultures, time and social class, and linguistic and social change manifests in the hybridisation of genres (Bakhtin, 1986; Fairclough, 1995a). In this study, the term 'register' is reserved to refer to the SFL traditions of text analysis, whereas the term 'genre' is taken to refer to generic identity of texts, i.e. 'what task the text is achieving in the culture' (Eggins and Martin, 1997: 237). However, as some text types such as speeches of individual politicians for example may not meet the contested definition of genre, the term 'discourse type' suggested by Partington (2010) is a preferred label in the description of the corpora make-up below.

It is important to bear in mind that each discourse type is a product of a combination of discursive practices that make it, to a certain extent, unique. Political speeches are different from news articles not only in terms of lexis and narrative structure, but also in terms of production processes and techniques. They have been created within different institutional settings, are characterised by different interpersonal relations between the authors and their audience, and will be received and interpreted in specific and different ways. In this regard, Swales (1990: 7) brings to our attention the evaluation of context by pointing out that we should not see genres solely as groups of texts. Some CDA-informed studies of journalistic discourses, for example, have been criticised for

their predominant focus on the textual product rather than the journalistic processes involved (Blommaert, 2005; Carvalho, 2008; Philo, 2007). As is discussed below, work with specialised corpora can partially address these concerns by collecting and recording (at the corpora compilation stage) maximum information available about production and reception of the target texts in particular socio-historical and institutional circumstances.

The examination of external parameters governing text production and reception can go hand in hand with evaluation of internal content and formal structures. From a number of techniques used for retrieving evidence from a corpus and further refining it, I chose the most common ones: concordancing, retrieval of collocations and word lists. Concordancer (or KWIC index: Key Word in Context) is the basic tool for observing patterns in a corpus. As Stubbs remarks, it represents 'a simple use of technology: search, display, find' (2001: 55). The computer searches for all the occurrences of a word form and displays the results in the centre of the screen within a limited span. Alternatively, results can be presented within the limits of a sentence or paragraph for a detailed study of extended context. As a large number of concordance lines usually requires further computer assistance, concordances can be processed by other programs that allow sorting according to various criteria (e.g. alphabetically, according to text files), as well as a more refined search within the displayed results. In the generation of collocates the software compiles a frequency list of all the words in the textual surrounding of a search term and then either displays raw information in this list or subjects it to further statistical processing.[1] A frequency list registers frequencies of all words in the corpus, and can be used on its own or as the basis for the generation of keywords. Depending on the data compared, keywords can be lexical items which reflect the topic of a particular text, or topics discussed in the corpus on the whole. Many researchers have found keywords a useful technique for a preliminary investigation of a specialised corpus (Tribble, 2000; Baker et al., 2008; Koteyko et al., 2013) or for a comparison of different corpora. Partington (2010), for example, draws extensively on this feature to compare different chronological periods.

The main types of corpora as distinguished by Sinclair (1995) are as follows:

1. Reference corpus, designed to provide comprehensive information about a language, e.g. the British National Corpus (BNC);
2. Monitor corpus that may have a constant size, but is constantly refreshed with new material, whereas old texts are archived, e.g. the Bank of English;

3. Parallel corpus, as a collection of texts translated into one or more other languages; and

4. Comparable corpus, compiled from similar texts in more than one language.

As corpus linguistic research progressed, other types have been added. In particular, the growing application of corpus linguistics in areas such as discourse analysis and professional writing has led to discussion of different types of *specialised* or *special purpose* corpora.

Hunston (2002: 14) defines a specialised corpus as a collection of texts designed to be representative only of a given type of text, such as the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English. De Beaugrande offers a similar definition of a specialised corpus as 'delimited by a specific register, discourse domain, or subject matter' (2001: 11). Baker (2006: 29) lists a diachronic corpus as a type of specialised corpus 'built in order to be representative of a language or a language variety over a particular period of time', such as SiBol newspaper corpora compiled at the universities of Siena and Bologna. Pearson (1998), however, shifts the emphasis from linguistic and situational parameters to particular aims of the investigator, and uses the expression 'a special purpose corpus' to refer to 'a corpus whose composition is determined by the precise purpose for which it is to be used' (1998: 48). In a similar vein, Valero (2006) uses the term 'ad hoc corpus' to refer to a collection of texts 'created with a specific use at a concrete moment: collecting in the smallest space the largest possible amount of certain documents' (2006: 452).

Unlike corpus linguistic studies performed on general corpora, where the content of the corpus is treated, often intentionally, as a 'black box', work with specialised corpora in discourse analysis has the opposite objective. The aim is, as Partington maintains, 'to acquaint ourselves as much as possible with the discourse type(s) under investigation' (2010: 90). For studies in this book I used the WordSmith program developed by Mike Scott (1999, 2011) which performs the three operations mentioned above: obtaining concordances, retrieving collocates and generation of word lists and keywords. In addition, an integrated browser, a useful feature inbuilt in WordSmith but missing in some other text analysis tools (e.g. Xkwic), was also extensively used. The program allows viewing of a larger context of a concordance as well as a whole source text where a search word occurred (View Text function). The use of these features allowed me to engage with the data in a variety of ways, sometimes bolstering my intuition and sometimes countering it, but on the whole enabling me to acquire a good knowledge of both general patterns and potentially unique phenomena in need of further investigation.

4.2   The argument for specialised corpora

According to Flowerdew (2005b), the use of specialised corpora began in the 1980s with the work of Tim Johns who compiled corpora in the field of plant biology and engineering to show the potential of corpus techniques in language analysis. Later this tradition was continued through the creation of specialised corpora of academic writing, other professional discourses such as business and advertising and – most recently – through a compilation of texts with the aim to analyse political discourses. Although Flowerdew lists a number of guidelines for compiling specialised corpora, she also points out 'the ever changing landscape in this burgeoning field' (2005b: 27), as data collection is likely to be highly dependent on the discourse type under investigation. Furthermore, the widely differing purposes and applications of specialised corpora also have direct implications for issues of representativeness and corpus size, two extensively debated topics in corpus linguistic literature.

Representativeness is typically discussed in the context of reference and monitor corpora. When it comes to specialised corpora, however, Williams notes that representativeness is rendered impossible at the outset because of 'the need to target a disciplinary or thematic speciality' (2002: 45), as well as the fact that such corpora tend to be built following external, and mostly bibliographic, criteria. The aggregation of different texts under such criteria inevitably leaves out the information about who produced the texts, the intended audience and purpose – in other words, the key information for analysing communication in context as part of a corpus-assisted study of discourse. As a result, these categories 'do not represent, rather they compromise' (ibid.). The pragmatic factors such as availability of particular data that often come into play in the compilation of specialised corpora also affect representativeness (Flowerdew, 2005b: 26). In the compilation of corpora of this study, for example, I had to rely on a combination of purposive and convenience sampling as the data were available only from a limited number of sources (see the next section).

Considering the above limitations in the creation of a specialised corpus for discourse analysis, it seems reasonable to approach the issue of corpus representativeness from the perspective of language users, i.e. discourse community, as defined by Swales (1990). Each discourse community is formed around topics of common interest, is finite in size, and develops its own ways of communication and intertextual referencing between members. As it is difficult, and often impossible, to

account for the totality of texts produced by a discourse community, the concept of representativeness has to be replaced by justification. From such a perspective, the corpus is seen as a segment of discourse (see also Busse, 2003; Busse et al., 1994). To claim that such a corpus constitutes a reference for a discourse under study means it provides the specification of the main subjects of a theme, time span, authorship, medium and any other parameters established by the researcher who aims to analyse the discourse. Providing information on these points and links to know more if desired, the analyst demonstrates the ability to justify the choice of material s/he is working with.

Specialised corpora are also inevitably smaller in size than their general and reference corpora counterparts, although definitions of a 'small-sized' corpus vary in relation to the object of investigation. Aston (1997), for example, regards small corpora as consisting of 20,000 and up to 200,000 words, whereas other researchers have worked with collections of texts counting less than 20,000 tokens (e.g. Shalom, 1997). The frequently cited view that bigger size is always better is often justified by the speculations that a larger number of texts will present a more reliable picture of what is typical of a language or a language variety. This is true in the case of corpora used for lexicographical purposes as they are designed to look at the whole language, often running into hundreds of millions of words. For one researcher, however, compilation of multi-million word corpora is still a difficult task to undertake. Moreover, a targeted investigation of specific areas of language use, such as a particular discourse type, is bound to be restricted to a certain number of texts. Reliance on smaller specialised corpora is therefore increasingly becoming accepted, especially in such areas as language teaching and genre studies.

Homogeneity and high specialisation are the main inherent advantages of specialised corpora. Reference corpora often preclude analysis of specific patterns characteristic of discourse types, unless such patterns feature heavily in the given culture to show up in the general corpus. Even if they are present in reference corpora, such patterns may not always be accessible to the analyst due to restrictions in search and retrieval functions for subdomains where genres of interest may be represented. By contrast, the small-scale, and often monogeneric corpora allow for sophisticated search procedures and a higher level of control over the data. As mentioned in the introduction, software such as WordSmith allows easy movement from concordance lines, to a close reading of whole text(s). From the methodological perspective, this translates into access to context of situation and

context of culture, an opportunity to conduct both quantitative and qualitative analyses, including a study of intertextual links, and a comparative focus.

These methodological advantages make it clear how specialised corpora provide an answer to a long-standing criticism that corpora represent repositories of text impoverished or void of context (e.g. Hunston, 2002). Partington (2004), for example, defends corpus-based discourse analysis by pointing out that in a collection of texts of similar type the interactional processes and the contexts they take place in remain reasonably constant, or at least alter in relatively predictable ways (p. 13). In a similar vein, Flowerdew (2005a) points to the value of specialised corpora where 'the compiler-cum-analyst' does have familiarity with the wider context required for interpretative work and can therefore act as 'a kind of mediating ethnographic specialist informant to shed light on the corpus data' (2005a: 329). In the case of specialised corpora used in discourse analysis, such familiarity is not accidental to the process of data collection but constitutes one of the main research objectives. Through the explicit aim of assessing a socio-historical context and institutional circumstances via document analysis and examination of secondary data at the corpora compilation stage, the researcher performs the first level of contextual analysis (see Table 2.1). The compilation of such corpora will catch the initial level of ethnographic detail required, which has been found to be particularly lacking in CDA studies of news articles (Carvalho, 2008). In this way, knowledge of context together with a generally smaller size and composition leads to the possibility of conducting a qualitative study that would complement or triangulate the results obtained through the quantitative processing of patterns.

Another possibility is to conduct a study of different levels of intertextuality, as elaborated in Chapter 2. Kristeva's theory of intertextuality reminds us that audiences do not rely just on the text in question in their interpretation; their decoding is shaped by other texts the readers bring to the interpretation process. Equally, the authors of text actively recontextualise other texts in the process of text production. Scholars of genre analysis therefore put forward a dynamic view of genres as ongoing processes of discourse production and reception shaped and influenced by other socially and culturally related texts (Bazerman, 1994). Such intertextual connections are missing or remain unaccounted for in reference corpora, where the sampling of genres is done according to content-external criteria. By 'connection' here I mean links established between texts that focus on a particular topic and/or are written by members of

the same discourse community. These connections become paramount when our aim is a diachronic analysis of cultural connotations and, wherever possible, must be established and documented at the corpus compilation stage.

The final methodological advantage lies in conducting a comparative analysis which has already been capitalised upon by researchers from a number of fields, including education and medical sociology. Seale et al. (2006), for example, compared interview corpora with online blog posts to reveal gendered patterns of language use, while Flowerdew (2005b) discussed studies of specialised learner corpora comparing non-native speaker and native speaker writing. Of key interest in this book is the comparison between different discourse types synchronically to reveal ideological constraints, as well as diachronically in order to study changes in patterns over time.

4.3 Corpora in this study

In the context of this study, machine-readable texts were selected according to a set of explicit criteria in order to make each corpus a segment of the discourse under investigation. The corpora described below consist of whole texts held in common format and accessible 'as if they formed a single character string' (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001: 3). At the same time, and crucially for the analysis undertaken in Chapters 6 and 7 of this book, it is possible to view the original text as a whole or in the form of several paragraphs. The material included in the corpora is not tagged, which makes it impossible to search for examples with specific morphological or syntactic features. It is a major disadvantage from the perspective of a detailed linguistic analysis, which, however, can be partially redressed by using different search and sort functions offered by the Wordsmith Tools software.

The corpora clearly fall within the category of smaller, specialised collections of texts. The newspaper corpora contain just under 1 million and 2 million running words each, whereas the corpus of political speeches is slightly over 200,000 tokens. As is discussed in the next section, pragmatic considerations have played the main role in decisions regarding how large the corpora should be, although traditions of corpora compilation were also taken into account. Thus, in limiting the size of the pro-Communist press corpus to 1 million tokens I was guided by previous analyses of specialised corpora such as Piper's (2000) examination of a 900,000-word corpus of British and EU literature on lifelong learning.

The pilot corpus and the corpus of the patriotic opposition press (the CPOP)

I started my research into meanings of loanwords in Russian without a specific discourse in mind. The idea to investigate the texts of the pro-Communist newspapers crystallised only after a background study of general trends in the use of loanwords in the Russian language. At the initial stage of this research in 2003, a decision had to be taken regarding a suitable data source for examining the language of the post-perestroika period. At that time there was no reference corpus available for public use and I had to compile my own pilot corpus from online texts of Russian periodicals. This pilot corpus served not only as a basis for a preliminary investigation of the use of loanwords in Russian periodicals; at a later stage, its texts were included in two corpora employed for further analysis of the loanwords. Below I therefore first provide a brief description of the steps taken to compile the corpus, and then outline general procedures in the compilation of the corpora built on its basis.

The key aim behind the creation of the pilot corpus was to analyse the different meanings many loanwords had been acquiring as a result of the determinologisation process. The data were collected from a variety of web-based sources, downloading texts from newspaper websites or using e-libraries. Most online newspapers have duplicates in print, which, apart from some assurance that they can be traced to an archive or a library (in case they disappear from the Web), also allowed me to find out how widely the sources had been circulated. One of the disadvantages stemming from the use of online data, however, is limited access to earlier publications; in this case the earliest web-based newspaper issues dated back only to 1996.

Three types of periodicals were used as sources of data: popular journals and magazines (comprising *c*.554,000 tokens), general newspapers (242,000 tokens) and business newspapers and journals (*c*.192,000).[2] The newspaper selection was driven by the aim to include publications representing the mainstream at the time of the study. For example, *Rossiyskaya gazeta* was, and is, an official media outlet of the Russian government, readership of *Moskovskiy Komsomolets* extended beyond the regional boundaries, and *Nezavisimaya Gazeta* also enjoyed widespread popularity among the Russian liberal audience. Some of the newspapers and journals are not strictly specialised business editions but rather general periodicals with emphasis on business news. For example, the newspaper *Kommersant-daily* has only one strictly business-related section called 'Деньги' ('Money'), with other sections covering national and regional sociopolitical events. Similarly, the journal *Deloviye lyudi* ('Business People') includes such sections as Красота и здоровье ('Beauty

and Health'), Стиль ('Style') and Образование ('Education') in addition to the section 'Finance'. When selecting texts from the newspapers for download, preference was given to articles over brief news reports, reports on inflation fluctuations, etc. in order to minimise instances of terminological use. The source websites are listed in Table 4.1.

It is difficult to provide unifying and stable labels for political orientations of the Russian periodicals in the period under study, given the changes in ownership and the complex 'information climate' in Russia on the whole (de Smaele, 1999; Krasnoboka, 2003; Zassoursky, 2004, 2009). Periodicals included in the Russian press corpus contain a mix of continuously pro-government papers such as *Rossiyskaya gazeta* and papers that displayed liberal orientations: *Ogonyok*, *Segodnya* (closed down in 2001 as part of the campaign against Vladimir Gusinskiy's Media-Most group), *Izvestiya*, *Kommersant*, *Komsomolskaya Pravda* and *Moskovskiy Komsomolets*.

In the case of such periodicals such as *Sovetskaya Rossiya* and *Zavtra*, the task is obviously easier as these newspapers overtly and continuously supported the patriotic opposition. *Sovetskaya Rossiya* in particular remained the only newspaper to cover the 1999 election from the oppositional angle, when Putin dominated TV coverage and quotes from his speeches peppered the majority of the above print publications (Zassoursky, 2004). The weekly newspaper *Zavtra* ('Tomorrow') is the leading edition of the patriotic opposition in Russia. With a circulation of 100,000 issues, it is

Table 4.1   Internet resources used for the compilation of the pilot corpus

Part of corpus	Title and URL
General newspapers	*Izvestiya* www.izvestia.ru
	Nezavisimaya Gazeta www.ng.ru
	Rossiyskaya gazeta www.rg.ru
	Komsomolskaya Pravda www.spb.kp.ru
	Trud www.trud.ru
	Selskaya zhizn www.sgazeta.ru
	Moskovskiy Komsomolets www.mk.ru
	Pravda www.pravda.ru
	Sovetskaya Rossiya www.sovross.ru
	Gazeta www.gazeta.ru
	Zavtra www.zavtra.ru
Business newspapers and journals	*Finansoviye izvestiya* www.finiz.ru
	Kommersant-daily www.kommersant.ru
	RossBusinessConsulting www.rbc.ru
	Deloviye lyudi www.dl.mk.ru
	Ekonomika i zhizn www.eg-online.ru

edited by the well-known nationalist writer Aleksandr Prokhanov. In the early 1990s, Prokhanov collaborated with Gennady Zyuganov which led to publications linking nationalist movements and Communist organizations (for example, *Word to the People* [Слово к народу] written in 1991), and to the support of Zyuganov's candidacy in the 1996 presidential elections. Later, *Zavtra* continued to orient towards social groups espousing both nationalist and Communist ideas and Prokhanov became one of Zyuganov's key advisors (March, 2002). Although the circulation of the newspaper is not large in comparison with other more mainstream periodicals, Prokhanov 'remains one of the most influential ideologues of contemporary Russian nationalism and *Zavtra* serves as his most public tribune' (Suspitina, 1999: 114).

Once the pilot corpus had been compiled, thesauri and glossaries of English economic terms in Russian (Lozovskii et al., 1997; Novikov, 1994) and Russian dictionaries of foreign words (Andreeva et al., 1997; Komlev, 1995; Krysin, 1998) were consulted to make a list of business-related loans which were then input into the WordSmith software to find out their frequency in the corpus. To qualify for inclusion in the set of loanwords to be examined, each word had to have at least 20 citations. The final list obtained as the result of this process is as follows: (in descending order of frequency): *бизнес* (business), *бизнесмен* (businessman), *приватизация* (privatisation), *менеджер* (manager), *менеджмент* (management), *дефолт* (default), *маркетинг* (marketing), *дилер* (dealer), *брокер* (broker), *ваучер* (voucher), *пиар* (PR) and *риелтор* (realtor/estate agent). According to the definition proposed by Alatortseva (1999), these loanwords are neologisms. Alatortseva sees neologisms first of all as a sociolinguistic category, and maintains that words and phrases that are 'new coinages of a certain chronological period, internal and external borrowings' as well as 'words and word combinations which became actualized in the given period' can all be included in the category of 'neologisms' (Alatortseva 1999: 16, my translation). The crucial factor is not the date of borrowing but their meaning at a certain historical moment: loanwords (as any other words) that have changed their status and started to be used with a new meaning qualify for this contextual definition as a neologism.[3] As a result, we can include in this category both the pre-Soviet business-related lexis 'revived' after the years of Communist rule (Chapter 3), such as *business* and *businessman*, and the new lexis characterising 'the age of reforms' – for example, such words as *privatisation, voucher* and *manager* that were borrowed into Russian in the period between 1986 and 1993.

An examination of contexts in which the preselected loanwords were used in the pilot corpus led to the following observations: (a) they are used

with meanings different from their meanings in English; (b) they have different and sometimes opposite connotations, i.e. the same loanword can be used pejoratively and with positive undertones; (c) the pejorative uses can be traced predominantly to the newspapers of the patriotic opposition. This led to a decision to compile a separate corpus of the patriotic opposition press (the CPOP), where the pejorative connotations of the loanwords could be investigated.

A straightforward way to compile the corpus would have been to download extra texts. However, as corpus compilation by a lone researcher can be an extremely time-consuming task, for it to be worthwhile the analyst has to look for ways to at least partially ensure that the phenomena s/he is investigating would have adequate frequency in the corpus. Here the results gained from the investigation of the pilot corpus, and specifically the information on the frequencies of the preselected loanwords, became useful. The most frequent words *бизнес*, *менеджер* and *приватизация* were included in the search syntax shown below, which resulted in a list of URLs specifying the location of texts on the websites of patriotic opposition newspapers. In this way, it became possible to compile a corpus with a higher density of loanwords than one that could have been obtained through the simple downloading of all the texts available. The search syntax is as follows:

- The site: syntax
- Example: site: www.left.ru; бизнес | менеджер | приватизация

The Boolean operator AND represented by the vertical bar (|) is used in the syntax to ensure that text displayed in search results contains at least one of the specified keywords.

At the initial stage of data collection, I started from the webpage www.zavtra.ru which was used in the pilot project. The list was then extended through links and references supplied on this site to include www.duel.ru; www.iskra.ru; www.left.ru; www.rednews.ru; www.sovross.ru; www.zavtra.ru; www.zvezda.ru.[4] Additionally, texts were also downloaded from the 'EastView Central Russian Newspapers' directory.[5]

When compiling corpora based on newspaper texts, potential differences between different orientations of newspaper texts need to be taken into account (Flowerdew et al., 2002). In genre-based studies, the hard news texts are assigned the function of 'reporting genres' with associated values of neutrality and objectivity. The soft news texts function as special interest genres localising national news for their readers, whereas newspaper columns and editorials function as overt opinion

genres specifically targeted at presenting arguments in favour of or against an issue. Readers' letters voicing public responses to previously published news articles, letters and comments comprise a standalone category of 'response genres' (Tardy, 2009: 274).

Published by 'patriotic opposition' outlets, all texts in the CPOP clearly belong to the opinion-oriented category, as newspapers of the opposition make no effort to conceal their bias. Their role is to reinforce the existing prejudice, excite their readership and persuade them about 'wrong' policies of the ruling government. Hence there is no division into news reports and editorials. This is how the editor of the newspaper *Zavtra* Alexandr Prokhanov defines its aims in an interview published in *Komsomolskaya Pravda*:

> Наша газета не является традиционной информационной газетой, кото-рая гоняется за новостями. В какой-то степени мы являемся газетой-прокламацией … Мы не можем себе позволить дискутировать, идти на дискуссии с противниками. Эти дискуссии ведутся, но ведутся в ритмах войны (20 August 1998). [Our newspaper is not a traditional informa-tive newspaper chasing news. To some extent, it is a proclamatory type of a newspaper … We cannot afford to discuss things, engage in discussions with opponents. Such discussions take place, but they are conducted on war terms.]

The downloaded texts were chronologically arranged into three periods and stored in separate text files, each containing approximately 300,000 tokens:

- 1998–99
- 2000–1
- 2002–3

Easy retrieval of whole texts and information on text production is a crucial factor in corpus-assisted discourse analysis. For this reason, care was taken to facilitate access to the background information through general mark-up. When opened with text-editing software, the texts form a single character string: one text is followed by another in ascend-ing chronological order. A special header for each text was created to be retrieved, if necessary, through the 'View Text' function. The header contains the following information:

- Source/URL: This allows the researcher to access the original www. site where the data were downloaded from;

- Text title: Where there was an actual title given in the (online) text, this was noted here;
- Date of text origin: When the text was originally written;
- Type of text/orientation: Editorial, reader's letter, specific column
- Connections to other texts from the corpus (e.g. if the text is a reader's letter in response to another article)
- Other

The penultimate item on the list is necessary for the documentation of intertextual connections. It is not uncommon for journalists to expand on previous topics raised in earlier newspaper editions. When they do so in the CPOP, the article subtitles often signal such inter-textual connections, as in the following example, 'По следам нашей публикации. Пробитые крылья державы' ('Following the footsteps of our previous publication. The punched wings of the great power'). Moreover, publications such as *Sovetskaya Rossiya* and *Zavtra* also convey opinions through readers' letters (contributed by politicians, academics and the public at large) which are explicit reactions either to the content of hard news articles from other newspapers or to columns and editorials published in these opposition periodicals. Articles downloaded from the 'EastView Central Russian Newspapers' directory contain additional information on text length (the number of running words), size in kilobytes, and the number of pages in a printed version. These principles of data storage and mark-up are expected to facilitate the retrieval of background information and are extensively used in Chapter 7.

The Russian press corpus (the RPC)

Comparison of texts and discourse types across corpora (Stubbs, 2001; Partington, 2003) is an important element of corpus-assisted discourse analysis. For comparative purposes in this study, a corpus was built from the periodicals published during the same time span as the texts of the patriotic opposition press. By this point in the research process, it became possible to use a larger collection of the *Ogonyok* journal articles kindly shared by colleagues from the University of Tübingen (further referred to as the *Ogonyok* corpus). This subcorpus consisting of journal issues released between 1997 and 2003[6] was combined with texts from the pilot corpus (after the pro-Communist newspapers had been removed). This transformed version comprising 2,362,000 words was named, for simplicity, the Russian press corpus (the RPC).

The RPC is comparable to the CPOP both in terms of medium and time period, which is of particular importance when neologisms constitute the main object of investigation. The compilation of this corpus was thought to be advantageous over the use of the Russian National Corpus (the RNC) available at www.ruscorpora.ru at the time of analysis. Although the RNC includes articles from a variety of Russian periodicals, texts of individual newspapers are not accessible in the form of separate subcorpora. The option of constructing one's own subcorpus is therefore limited to a preselection according to macro-generic areas (advertising, education, official documents, etc.), genres (bibliography, annotation, memo, etc.) and themes (fitness, education, religion, etc.) rather than according to newspaper titles. In this way, it was not possible to exclude newspapers that explicitly construe their position as part of an extremist or counter-discourse.

Whereas opposition newspapers openly declare their aim to change public opinion, the majority of publications included in the RPC present themselves as sources of information. Their aims are seemingly more diverse than that of the opposition media and include not only opinion-laden discussion of political events in editorials, but also informational coverage of a broad range of issues. General newspapers included in the RPC from the pilot corpus (Table 4.1), for example, contain a range of discourse types represented in different sections: news reports, political commentaries, short overviews of cultural topics, and economic forecasts. This makes the collection of texts in the RPC a mixture of different discourse types, which would have to be assessed individually if the corpus was employed in qualitative analysis. A further important factor in such an assessment would be the changes in ownership, which after 2000 should be viewed through the prism of state control over main media groups.

The corpus of presidential speeches (the CPS)

The corpus of presidential speeches was collected on the basis of texts downloaded from the president's website www.kremlin.ru. The website is the major repository of the transcripts of speeches given by Vladimir Putin during his presidency, as well as other documents such as decrees. The data comprise speeches and addresses delivered at a broad variety of venues such as congresses, conferences, opening and award ceremonies and those that are the prerogative of only the president – the two inauguration speeches and the annual 'Address to the Federal Government'. The data were collected with the help of the open source GNU Wget software package and cleaned of HTML tags. Only monologic texts (total word count – 210,000) were included. The texts were stored in

separate files, one per year, comprising 10 files in total. Two of these files contain only three speeches each (the file for 1999 covering Putin's acting presidency and 2008 covering the last months of the second presidency). The text headers contain the information about the speech title and the date when it was delivered.

The texts cover the period from 1999 to 2008 and include the president's annual addresses to the Federal Assembly (*Послание* 2005, 2004, 2003, 2002, 2000; *Ежегодное послание* 2001) which focus on different but interconnected topics. The first period of acting presidency started on 31 December 1999 when Boris Yeltsin unexpectedly resigned and, according to the constitution, Putin became acting president of the Russian Federation. He was inaugurated president on 7 May 2000, which marked the beginning of his first presidency (2000–4). The second presidency (2004–8) term started when Putin was re-elected on 14 March 2004. In the speeches delivered during the first years of his presidency, Putin emphasised the necessity of strengthening the state, the need for administrative and tax reforms, as well as reform of the federal structure. The 2003 address underlined the necessity of making Russia a strong power, whereas speeches in 2005 outlined the vision of Russia as a democratic state, emphasising the need to tackle corrupt bureaucracy and promote freedom for entrepreneurs (Schröder, 2008).

Monologic speeches have a higher level of scriptedness, unlike the dialogic verbal engagements such as interviews or press conferences, where at times Putin took famous language liberties.[7] As always in the case when the language of politicians is under consideration, the question arises as to what extent Putin's speeches can be treated as his own language. The speechwriting team working for Putin's oratory output, headed by the president's aide Dzhokhan Pollyeva, counted up to 40 members (*Sobesednik*, 3 May 2006). In this regard, Goffman (1981) distinguishes between the animator as the person who actually does the speaking, the 'body engaged in acoustic activity' and the principal as 'someone whose position is established by the words that are spoken ... someone who is committed to what the words say' (Goffman, 1981: 144). Because a clear separation between the writer and the 'animator' (Goffman, 1981) of the speeches is impossible here, I share the position that the politician as the 'principal' of his or her statements is always solely responsible for their content and form (Wodak et al., 1999: 71).

To sum up, the discussion of corpora compilation principles in this chapter aimed to demonstrate that within the confines of a corpus-assisted analysis, a *corpus* does not stand for merely an aggregate of texts amenable for statistical processing. In the creation of specialised corpora

for discourse analysis, the crucial aspects of corpus design are the similarity of factors relating to text production and reception, and a shared repertoire of topics. To perform a diachronic analysis of discourse, the analyst-cum-corpus compiler would need to ensure that chronologically arranged texts contain intertextual connections. Equally important are the processes of corpus management. A specific mark-up with contextual information together with different ways of searching, sorting and retrieval enabled by corpus linguistic software are indispensable for interpretative analysis, where emphasis is placed both on the software-generated patterns and intertextual reading of individual texts. As the next two chapters show, following these specific principles of corpus compilation and management enabled me to investigate the socio-historical aspects of meaning production in discourses of different political groups.

5
Analysis of Quantitative Trends

This chapter sets out to examine the textual environment of the loan-words in order to obtain a closer picture of the associations they form with words in their context. The objective is to find recurrent patterns for each loanword and determine whether they have patterns in common. CDA studies rely on lexical co-occurrence when identifying evaluation in texts and making assumptions about discursive strategies of text producers, but lack a systematic procedure for identifying co-occurrences across the whole sample. Corpus linguistic techniques provide such reliable description of regularities[1] that can then be interpreted against the theories of discourse. In the analysis below I treat my corpora as a repository of evidence on the following aspects: (1) lexical and grammatical realisations of the loanwords; (2) semantic field in which each loanword is realised; (3) discourse realisations of the loanwords.

5.1   Examining the patterns of use

Lexico-grammatical patterning: the concepts of collocation and colligation

The concept of collocation is central to the examination of usage tendencies in this study. The first and widely known definition of collocation is given by Firth (1951/1957: 179), who observes that 'you shall know a word by the company it keeps'. Clear (1993: 277) defines collocation as 'a recurrent co-occurrence of words', whereas Kjellmer (1987: 133) maintains that collocation is 'a sequence of words that occurs more

than once in identical form' which is 'grammatically well structured'. Despite the variations in these definitions, the common emphasis is on co-occurrence, or likelihood of words to occur together. For the description of units formed by the loanwords in this study I adopt the terminology proposed by Sinclair (1996a), defining a word of interest as 'node', and reserving the term 'collocate' for words that occur in the limited context of the node.[2]

Studies of collocation emphasise different aspects of this phenomenon (for example, one can distinguish between the lexical composition, semantic or structural approaches, see Nelson, 2000). Here I adopt the view of collocation as a close interrelationship of grammar and lexis (Hunston et al., 1997). According to Sinclair's (1991: 115) concept of upward collocation, upward collocates are represented by prepositions, adverbs, pronouns and conjunctions, whereas downward collocates are nouns, verbs and adjectives (Sinclair, 1991: 116). Because of the focus on meaning in this study, predominant attention is paid to lexical/downward collocates, whereas upward collocates are taken into account in the analysis of grammatical patterns.

The close proximity of co-occurring words is not the only property associated with the notion of collocation. The idea of *collocational span* introduces a different perspective, namely that words not adjacent to the node can still contribute to a description of its characteristic uses (and still be referred to as 'collocates'). A span refers to the number of word forms, before and after the node, within which collocates are studied. In this case, grammatical ties and syntactic patterning are usually disregarded, and the node and its collocates are represented as bigrams. To avoid confusion with the type of collocation as an adjacent lexical pattern these are referred to as node–collocate pairs (Sinclair, 1991). Thus, the collocational profiles listed in Appendix 1 consist of the node and its collocates within the predetermined span of 5:5, whereas collocations are presented separately in Appendix 2. In cases where there are enough instances of their usage, collocational profiles of the derivatives *ваучерный* (from *voucher*), *приватизационный* (from *privatisation*) and *пиаровский* (from *PR*) are also examined.

Following Firth, Hoey (2000: 234) describes the phenomenon of colligation as the 'grammatical company a word keeps and the positions it prefers; in other words, a word's colligations describe what it typically does grammatically'. Here grammatical patterning of the loanwords is seen as complementary to the analysis of collocation and used as a means to identify and present the combinations they form with other words.

Realisation of a word in a semantic field: semantic preference

Words tend to be used with other words that are semantically similar. A concordance profile of a word together with its collocational profile make an excellent source for identification of what kind of 'semantic company', to go on using Firth's metaphor, words can keep. Moving in this research direction, Sinclair (1991) and Stubbs (1996, 2001) observe that it is possible to group collocates of the node according to semantic criteria. For example, Stubbs (2001: 64) in his investigation of the lemma *commit* shows that it collocates with a small set of semantically related words, such as *adultery, sin, suicide*. He proposes to characterise this set by a semantic descriptor of 'crimes and/or behaviour which is socially disapproved of'. What we observe here is the phenomenon of semantic preference, that is 'the relation not between the individual words, but between a lemma or word-form and a set of semantically related words' (Stubbs, 2001: 65). In corpus-assisted analyses of discourse this is the stage where the notion of collocation as a statistical co-occurrence is turned into a quantitative marker of ideology, as co-occurrence with semantic sets is used as the basis for making judgements about discursive strategies (see e.g. Fairclough, 2000; Koller and Mautner, 2004; Baker et al., 2008).

However, the treatment of collocation as not only linguistic but also a discursive phenomenon means that we leave the domain of software-driven pattern identification and enter the area of subjective judgement, particularly when we start grouping collocates into sets. Here the analyst is bound to encounter problems with the elastic boundaries of what constitutes a 'semantic field' or set, as well as with what to include under the umbrella of negative or positive evaluation.

Discourse realisation of a word: semantic prosody

Whereas semantic preference provides information about the realisation of a search term in a certain semantic field, the phenomenon of semantic prosody[3] is helpful for presenting evidence of how it is realised in discourse, i.e. pragmatically[4] (Sinclair, 1991).

The phenomenon was initially pointed out by Sinclair in his discussion of the patterning associated with the verb *happen* and the phrasal verb *set in*. Sinclair (1987: 155–6) observes that a typical subject of the verb is often something unpleasant, and lists *decay, rot, malaria, ill-will, decadence, impoverishment, infection, disillusion, anarchy, prejudice, rigor mortis*, etc. as examples of words and phrases co-occurring with the

verb. Drawing on this example, Louw (1993: 158) suggests that the characteristic patterning associated with *set in* can be described as 'semantic prosody' in the Firthian sense of prosody to mean 'phonological colouring which was capable of transcending [the] segmental boundaries [of words]'. Here Louw defines the phenomenon as 'a consistent aura of meaning with which a form is imbued by its collocates' (1993: 157).

The definition was adopted in numerous empirical analyses, but at the same time engendered considerable scholarly debate. One of the main concerns according to Whitsitt (2005), for example, is that this definition treats the node word as 'an empty form' that is to be 'filled' with collocates. This leads to a suggestion that there is a semantic transfer from collocates to the node. In this way, semantic prosody is represented as an indicator of the change in meaning of the node despite the fact that it is a phenomenon established on the basis of a synchronic observation. Louw's later definition as 'a form of meaning which is established through the proximity of a consistent series of collocates, often characterisable as positive or negative …' (2000: 50) avoids this problematic suggestion, but seems to equate semantic prosody with semantic preference (only that here collocates would be grouped under a 'negative' or 'positive' semantic set). Bednarek (2008) questions this representation of the relation between the two phenomena as set and subset, insisting that it does not realise the full potential of semantic prosody. Earlier research by Sinclair (1996 a, b) and Stubbs (2001) also suggests that the difference between these two phenomena is more fundamental than can be assumed from Louw's description.

Two observations stemming from this recent debate on the nature and identification of semantic prosody are relevant for analyses presented in this book. First, semantic prosody needs to be examined at a deeper stage of abstraction than semantic preference (Bednarek, 2008; Stewart, 2010; Philip, 2011). Whereas semantic preference depends on collocation, that is when the node is used with words from a particular semantic set, prosody tends to be described in terms of connection between the node and wider stretches of text. It is therefore 'capable of the wide range of realization because in pragmatic expressions the normal semantic values of the words are not necessarily relevant' (Sinclair, 1996b: 87). What analysts typically observe in such cases can be words or expressions pointing to a certain discourse feature which may or may not have a clear linguistic realisation. In this regard,

Whitsitt (2005) points out that lexis that appears to the immediate left of Sinclair's example of *set in* is highly variable and only some words can be called collocates in the full sense of the term, i.e. they occur frequently in a specified position. Similarly, Partington maintains that prosodies can 'depend on a whole chunk of preceding discourse or, a vaguer referring term such as demonstrative *this* or *that*' (Partington, 2004: 135). In such instances, semantic prosody is a pragmatic interpretation by the analyst of extended sections of co-text. Consequently, whereas the observation of semantic preference is relatively straightforward, the identification of semantic prosody is fraught with difficulties inherent in the assigning of semantic and pragmatic roles to the node.

   Second, semantic prosody, as well as semantic preference, is genre or register-dependent (O'Halloran, 2007). In his analysis of the word *lavish* in the Bank of English, Partington (2004), for example, finds that it has an unfavourable prosody in news genres, whereas in such fields as the arts and entertainment it is used with positive undertones. Partington therefore argues that in the discourse of newspaper reporting *lavish* could be accompanied by an indication that 'this word is often used to express disapproval', whereas in typical British conversation, this would not be the case (2004: 153). Similarly, Tribble (1998) maintains that there can be a universal or global semantic prosody for a word in relation to the whole language, and at the same time there can be a local semantic prosody specific to a given context or genre in which a word is used.

   In this study, semantic prosody is seen as an abstraction about the function of a lexical item in discourse made by the analyst on the basis of a variety of clues that s/he gleans from the co-text, as well as from the overall knowledge about the discourse type under study. We need repeated occurrences in the form of concordances to make claims about the existence of a semantic prosody. However, these can only serve as the first indicator of the node's textual function; a specialised corpus tied to a delimited social context (Chapter 4) and a qualitative study of extended stretches of co-text are necessary to explore the inextricably pragmatic nature of semantic prosody. The combination of both will give additional clues about *where, to whom* and *why* something means what it does and minimise ambiguity. Approached from this perspective, semantic prosody can be an important 'explanatory' tool for accounting for readers' reactions to 'resonances of intertextuality' present in a stretch of text (Hunston, 2007: 267).

The following list summarises the steps undertaken during the analysis:

1. Generation of keywords to establish the main topics characterising the CPOP (see Chapter 4);
2. Examination of concordance profiles to reveal characteristic tendencies in both corpora;
3. Automatic retrieval of collocates and lemmatisation; creation of collocational profiles;
4. Retrieval of collocations and further abstraction to colligation: investigation of lexical and grammatical relations between the loanwords and words in the immediate surroundings;
5. Identification of a semantic field in which each loanword is used: further examination of concordances and collocational profiles;
6. Identification of semantic prosodies: a detailed study of concordances and extended context, including whole texts via the 'View text' function. Comparison of the results with information obtained from collocational profiles.

The next section details the results obtained from the application of this methodology to the two corpora compiled for this study. As the dependency on discourse type is an essential feature characterising semantic associations of the loanwords, the term 'local semantic prosody' will be used from now on.

5.2   Analysis

Keywords in the CPOP

Keywords reflect thematic and stylistic choices of the writers (Scott, 1997). Here the keywords were identified with reference to the media discourse of the time frame in which the data were collected, not to the language overall. To create the keyword list, frequency lists were generated for the CPOP and the *Ogonyok* corpus as the control. This made it possible to establish the topic-related lexical areas of the CPOP, while eliminating the lexis common to the media language and political discourse in general, such as, for example, *страна* (country), *проводить*, (carry out), *правительство* (government), *закон* (law), which appear high up on the frequency list, but are not key. The first top ten keywords, sorted in order of decreasing salience, are: *Россия* (Russia), *имущество* (property), *власть* (power), *предприятие* (enterprise), *Чубайс* (Chubais), *предприниматели* (entrepreneurs), *рабочие* (workers), *государство* (state), *олигархи* (oligarchs) and *Путин* (Putin).

Among these, the prominence of *Russia* as the top lexical collocate deserves special attention. The unusually high frequency of this keyword reflects the Communists' alliance with nationalists that re-emerged after parliamentary elections in the form of a 'national-patriotic bloc' (Chapter 1). It resulted in the opposition front labelled the 'Russian resistance', which prioritised an ethnocentric understanding of the word 'Russian' (Flikke, 1999: 278). The oppositional leaders of this alliance devoted much more space to elaborating the meaning of Russian identity than the politicians in power (Tolz, 1998). The CPRF, for example, as the key contributor in this discourse, set up analytical centres with the aim of producing 'general theories' of Russia's nation building (Tolz, 1998: 1012).

The collocates of *Russia* (*страна/country, отечество/fatherland, народ/people, сильный/strong*) reveal how this alliance's rhetoric emphasises Russia's 'greatness' in history, Russian tradition and Soviet-time achievements. This includes references to great power ambitions of imperial and Soviet states, evoked though the concepts of *derzhava* and *gosudarstvennost'* (see Chapter 6). At the same time, a quick scan of concordances shows that *Russia* is positioned as both strong (*сильная Россия, ее уникальная культура, великая наука/strong Russia*, *its unique culture*, *great science*) and deficient in some sense (*Россия терпит/Russia suffers, Россия выносит/Russia endures, увязшая в долгах/bogged down in debt*). In this way, the keyword is actively used in fashioning a narrative that emphasises 'Russia's unique development on the Eurasian plain' and unique sociopolitical entity (Sakwa, 2008: 204) as well as the need to save the country from some impending disaster. This interpretation is in line with Urban's research (1998) who notes that the CPRF rhetoric in particular can be read like a folk tale where the 'hero-victim' the Russian nation, having survived the misfortune of the USSR breakdown, is now fighting various dark forces and evildoers.

The keyword *oligarch* together with words appearing lower on the list leave little doubt as to what the evildoers are. The uses of *oligarch* point to the negative deontic meaning and links with the ruling government displayed through such collocates as *власть* (power), *путин* (Putin), *интересы* (interests), *криминальный* (criminal), *реформаторы* (reformers), *бандит* (bandit), *незаконный* (unlawful), *нелегальный* (illegal) and *грабеж* (robbery). The word was found to be frequently used in other corpora covering the given period (Gorshkov, 2004) and is discussed as one of the political catchwords in post-Soviet discourse (Fruchtmann, 2004b). Its usage trends in the CPOP are in line with Sheigal's (2000: 143) observation that the term became a 'political swearword' in Russian and a synonym for a *scapegoat*, or 'враг общества №1' ('number one enemy').

The words *реформы* (reforms) and *буржуазия* (bourgeoisie), appearing further down the list, indicate that the topic of 'capitalist reforms' is particularly salient and discussed in pejorative contexts. Historically, Russian identity has long been presented in opposition to the 'barbarism' of the West. In the 1990s, the Communist and patriotic forces continued to uphold this opposition, combining references to contemporary evil (sociopolitical reforms) with traditional denunciation of 'bourgeois' ideology (Urban, 1996). Whereas the salience of *bourgeoisie* evokes traditional Communist discourse, it is interesting to note the absence of other equally iconic Soviet terms such as *Leninism*, *imperialism* and *comrade*.[5] This also seems to reflect the alliance of the Communists with patriotic forces, which resulted in the construction of a new identity where traces of Marxism-Leninism were diluted with abundant patriotic sentiments.

Among other keywords that have lower keyness value it is interesting to observe such negatively charged lexis as *воровство* (stealing), *криминальный* (criminal), *передел* (redivision), *кризис* (crisis), *сатанисты* (Satanists), *террористический* (terrorist, adj.), *ведьмы* (witches), *гнусный* (odious) and derogatory nicknames such as *дегенераты* (the degenerate) and *дерьмократы* (a play on the word 'democrat'). The particular combination of words evoking literary images (the use of *witches*, for example, turns out to be an allusion to Shakespeare's *Macbeth*), low-register lexis, and occasional semi-technical terminology is characteristic of the opposition press as such newspapers combine short passages imitating objective, factual reporting in hard news genres with stretches of text written in overtly persuasive style. In this way, they recontextualise existing news stories by adding or deleting thematic and grammatical structures and suffusing them with evaluation. The negatively charged keywords provide a 'bird's-eye view' of how such recontextualisation is achieved, and set the scene for a qualitative analysis of details and nuances.

Semantic preferences of the loanwords in the CPOP

The analysis of keywords allowed the examination of textual foci in the CPOP texts which will now be probed further through the study of collocates and relevant concordances. The first thing noticeable about the collocational tendencies of the economy-related loanwords in the CPOP is the relatively low frequency of business and economy lexis (Appendix 1). For example, the adjective *налоговый* (tax) appears only towards the end of the list generated for *business*. Instead, such words as *чиновник* (official), *политический* (political), *криминальный* (criminal, adj.), *президент*

(president) and *преступник* (criminal, noun) appear among its top collocates and, together with other less frequent but semantically related words, point to the preference for the lexis of politics and crime. Similar tendencies are evident from the collocational profiles computed for the rest of the loanwords.

The following three groups (individual semantic preferences are briefly covered in summary tables below) have a prominent presence in collocational profiles:

1. Words belonging to the vocabulary of politics or describing political activities: *власть* (power), *армия* (army), *полковник* (colonel), *чиновник* (official), *премьер* (prime minister), *президент* (president), *номенклатура* (nomenclature), *государство* (state), *режим* (regime), *руководитель* (leader), *выборы* (elections), *политический* (political), *законы* (laws), *губернатор* (governor), *пропаганда* (propaganda), *правительство* (government), *демократия* (democracy), *социализм* (socialism), *коммунизм* (Communism), *народ* (people), *депутаты* (deputies);
2. Words concerned with crime and illegal issues, such as, for example: *бандит* (bandit), *коррупция* (corruption), *незаконный* (unlawful, under-the-table), *нелегальный* (illegal), *нечестный* (dishonest), *черный* (black), *криминальный* (criminal), *теневой* (shadow), *оффшорный* (offshore), *наркотики* (drugs), *преступный* (culpable), *терроризм* (terrorism), *грабеж* (robbery), *воровской* (larcenous), *проституция* (prostitution), *рекетиры* (racketeers), *киллер* ([contract] killer), *кровавый* (bloody), *челночный* (shuttle). This group includes a subset of words used to describe people who do not work or who engage in fraud, e.g. *махинаторы* (fraudsters), *попрошайки* (beggars), *паразиты* (parasites), *жулики* (cheats, swindlers);
3. Words used in business-related contexts, or what Nelson (2000) calls 'lexis employed to talk about business', for example: *фирма* (firm), *предприниматель* (entrepreneur), *прибыль* (profit), *производство* (industry), *ресурсы* (resources), *лизинг* (leasing), *доход* (income), *средства* (means), *розничный* (retail), *капитал* (capital), *налоговый* (tax), *банк* (bank), *экономика* (economy), *деньги* (money), *реформа* (reform), *предприятие* (enterprise), *стабилизация* (stabilisation), *продажа* (sale), *собственность* (property), *акция* (share), *рынок* (market).

These semantic preferences are indicative of the tendency to discuss the meanings of the loanwords in relation to the 'dark' side of politics and business domains, such as corruption and fraud. The second group indicating preference for the semantic set of 'crime' can be united

with a less prominent group of pejorative adjectives, such as *одиозный* (odious) under a general label of the 'negative' set. However, this negative semantic set does not cover the total number of instances in which the loanwords are used to express negative evaluation. In other words, the presence of negatively charged collocates reveals only a small part of all the contexts where the negative deontic potential of the loanwords is realised. The following observations can explain this tendency: (1) the lexicalisation of the negativity within the collocational span is variable; (2) the negative lexalisation can be identified through longer stretches of co-text rather than adjacent lexis; and (3) it is intertextual and therefore out of reach for both concordance- and collocate-generating tools. Consequently, the analysis of discourse realisations in the next section pays attention both to the instances where the negativity is realised through the proximity of 'negatively charged'[6] collocates within the collocational span of 5:5, as well as to words and expressions that occur in the extended context.

As the CPOP has a diachronic dimension, it was interesting to examine whether there are any trends in semantic preferences that can be related to a period of time. Selecting the most frequent loanword *business* as an example, concordances were generated for each of the three periods and screened for collocations with words possessing negative deontic values. A comparative analysis across the periods revealed that the repetition of the collocations gradually increased towards 2003, whereas the variation in the lexicalisation of negativity decreased – a trend I will come back to in the next chapter.

Semantic prosodies of the loanwords in the CPOP and comparison with the RPC

Let us now consider what kind of pragmatic evidence we can gauge about the usage of the loanwords from their concordances and collocational profiles. Below I first present the lexico-grammatical analysis of the loanwords in the CPOP, paying special attention to their local textual functions. The patterns of use, summarised in tables, are then compared to the lexico-grammatical profiles of the loanwords drawn on the basis of the RPC.[7] The results are interpreted within the DHA framework (Chapter 2).

The loanword business

As one of the functional neologisms (Alatortseva, 1999) revived after perestroika, *business* has a history of negatively connoted use during

the Communist era. According to Krysin (2004: 115), the term was first registered in 'Литературная речь' by V. Z. Ovsyannikov (1933):

> Бизнес – слово, заимствованное из лексикона американских коммерческих дельцов; означает вообще в широком смысле 'дело, дающее доход'. В современном литературный советский обиход вошло как символ голого практицизма, чисто деляческого, 'американского' подхода к делу. [*Biznes* is a word that has been borrowed from the language of Americans involved in commercial activity, and in its broad sense it loosely means 'activity that produces an income'. It entered modern Soviet literary usage as a symbol of naked savoir-faire, of the coldly practical 'American' approach to business.[8]]

The loanword later acquired a negative connotation that was preserved and even strengthened when it began to be used with reference to Russians rather than foreigners (Krysin, 2004: 116). This trend is supported by evidence from the CPOP, as analysis of concordances points to the predominance of negative contexts. An examination of the collocational profile (Appendix 1) reveals semantic preference for the vocabulary of crime, as in over 75 per cent of instances *business* is employed to talk about stealing, corruption, drug dealing, prostitution and various ways of fooling people to get access to their money. People doing this 'business' are given pejorative labels that reflect their status in the criminal world, such as *тузы* (aces, criminal slang for people at the top of a hierarchy), or *воротилы* (wheeler-dealers). The expression 'to do business' is also suffused with negativity and refers to economic activity that is considered to be 'shady'.

   In terms of grammatical patterning, the majority of collocations with the loanword are represented by adjective–noun pairs. In addition, in the above grammatical pattern with a verb *business* is used in the sense of 'enterprise' and therefore functions as an object of a clause (Appendix 2). Of particular interest here is a less frequent colligatorial pattern evident from the concordances where the loanword is used as a collective uncount noun denoting 'a group of people engaged in entrepreneurship' and functions as subject of a clause. It collocates with action verbs, and in the third person takes the singular form of the verb. The following examples taken from the CPOP illustrate the pattern '*business* as subject':

> *бизнес грабит …*
> *бизнес не желает иметь дело …*
> *бизнес подкупает …*

The grammatical functions as an object and as subject of a clause are typical examples of disambiguation with the help of the phenomenon of colligation. The third person ending of a verb points to a sense of *business* which is identified by this particular pattern, and not transparent through the co-occurrence of this loanword with nouns and adjectives. As the above examples show, in the discourse of the patriotic opposition press the verbs instantiating this pattern are used either in the grammatical form of negation or denote actions that can be described as 'bringing undesirable, destructive results'.

The summary Table 5.1 and exemplary concordances below provide further information on the uses of *business*.

Interestingly, some collocations with neutral and positively charged lexis turned out to be instances of negative use once an extended context was engaged into interpretation. For example, at first glance, the collocation *большой бизнес* and *крупный бизнес* (both can be translated into English as a *large-sized* or *large-scale business*) may be seen as merely instances of semantic preference for the adjectives of scale and size.

Table 5.1   Negative use of *business* in the CPOP

Collocation	Colligation	Semantic preference
Незаконный, нелегальный, челночный, грязный	Uncount noun Adj-N	Illegal issues such as fraud or murder *грязный бизнес на крови*
акулы, воротилы, элита (стервятники, тузы ...)	Uncount noun N-N	Stealing, corruption *вот и заказали воротилы бизнеса могучего конкурента*
No collocates, a pattern with variable lexis *крупный, большой*	Collective noun N+V Uncount noun Adj-N	Destructive and manipulative action Size, scale *терроризм как сфера большого бизнеса;* *'крышевание' большого бизнеса*
семейный	Uncount noun Adj-N	Unethical issues in politics, nepotism, corruption *семейный бизнес из бюджетных средств*
делать (свой) бизнес на чем-либо	Uncount noun V+(pronoun)+ N+prep	To profiteer from *делать бизнес на больных;* *выгодно делать бизнес на здоровье людей;* *делающий на смуте свой бизнес*

N		Concordance		
294	явно «растут уши» заказчика —	крупного	бизнеса	. Увы! Если бы г. Немцов был
295	кцент на дестабилизирующей роли	крупного	бизнеса	, купающегося в роскоши на гла
296	Такого поворота событий "крупный	бизнес	" действительно серьезно опасаетс
297	Запада? А если учесть, что весь	крупный	бизнес	сконцентрирован под влиянием и
298	рдировщики- «невидимки».	"Крупный	бизнес	" явно ждал, что этот ультиматум
299	мелкие рэкетиры с годами стали	крупными	«бизнесменами»	, а нравы так называемог

N		Concordance		
86	шать 20% от теневого оборота	"большого	бизнеса	" —в противном случае они ста
87	ых группировок по "крышеванию"	большого	бизнеса	. Но на пути этого плана
88	м. Терроризм — это новая форма	большого	бизнеса	. В настоящее время агрессивные
89	сматривать терроризм как сферу	большого	бизнеса	. Искусственно направляемым и у
90	твом стоит большой бизнес — и	большой	бизнес	оплачивает всех «конкурентов» н
91	пор, пока убогие шестерки при	большом	бизнесе	их не отменили. Надо же, как

Figure 5.1 Concordances of *крупный бизнес* and *большой бизнес* (large-scale business)

However, it is clear from the surrounding co-text (Figure 5.1) that the collocation refers either to the activity of making money illegally, or to people who earned their money by illegal means and have a lot of influence in the economic and political affairs of the country. By contrast, the majority of collocations with such adjectives as *малый* (small), *мелкий* (small-sized) and *средний* (middle-sized) are used to describe the size of an enterprise or an economic sector without these negative undertones.

There is a similar tendency in the co-occurrence of *business* with the adjective *российский* (Russian), which is one of the most frequent patterns in the corpus. In contrast to other collocations with adjectives that point to a place or a country where business takes place, as in the examples *молдавский бизнес* (Moldavian business) or *украинский бизнес* (Ukrainian business), the adjective *российский* is co-selected with *business* predominantly when it refers to a negative state of affairs (which echoes Krysin's observation mentioned above). The whole expression has, therefore, a negative deontic value except for the contexts where it is clearly stated that this is not the case, as in the following example[9] where the collocation is modified by the adjective *цивилизованный* (civilised):

'[…] оказалось, что цивилизованный российский бизнес больше не желает иметь дело с человеком занимающимся откачкой денег зарубеж.' [it has turned out that the civilised Russian business does not want to deal with a person who specialises in forwarding money abroad].

Overall, the semantic preferences summarised in Table 5.1 point to a local textual function of 'destructive and manipulative action' in the CPOP. Only about 7 per cent of contexts where *business* is used do not

contain lexical or grammatical markers of negativity. Here the meaning is similar to that found in standard English and Russian dictionaries. Business in this sense can be described as either 'work relating to the buying and selling of goods', or as a 'company or firm'. This sense is predominant in the RPC, as can be seen from Table 5.2 (see also Figure 5.2).

The loanword businessman

This loanword displays tendencies in co-occurrence similar to those of *business*. The negative uses are evident from its concordances (Figure 5.3), which also display co-selection with the adjectives *российский* (Russian) and *крупный* (large-sized), as shown in Table 5.3.

   In the RPC, as shown by the concordances (Figure 5.4) and Table 5.4, the pattern of the semi-technical use is predominant.

The loanword privatisation

The loanword *privatisation* is also characterised by instances of negative use. The collocational profile displays semantic preference for the vocabulary of crime instantiated by such collocates as *незаконный* (illegal), *бандитский* (bandit), *грабеж* (robbery), *растащить* (pilfer) and *криминальный* (criminal), as well as for the semantic set that can be broadly labelled as 'governmental structures, authorities and state business': *государство*

Table 5.2   Semi-technical use of *business* in the RPC

Collocation	Colligation	Semantic preference
малый, средний, крупный, прибыльный	Uncount noun Adj-N	Money/size of business
алюминиевый, нефтяной, сырьевой	Uncount noun Adj-N	Line of business
центр, структура, сообщество	N-N	Institutions, organisations

N	Concordance		
1649	непричастностью людей к самостоятельному бизнесу	, с установкой на занятие предпри
1650	дисциплинированному бизнесу, тщательно бизнесу	, пщате, тщательно продумав проду
1651	о состоялся первый Всемирный конгресс по бизнесу	, этике и экономике, одно названи
1652	иям с партнерами стоит стремиться любому бизнесу	. Подумайте, какие ресурсы есть
1653	ванную литературу, одним словом, училась бизнесу	. А в декабре 1994-го родился сы
1654	зная, как это делается, не желая учиться бизнесу	. Борис Нуралиев научился -- в
1655	ом другом. «Делали выставку по малому бизнесу	. Выставка включала в себя три ос
1656	бойского подхода молодых президентов к бизнесу	. Достаточно вспомнить, например,
1657	Мариуполе. Теперь от биологии перейдем к бизнесу	. Здесь также возможны взаимотно
1658	это далеко не все, что нужно модельному бизнесу	. Не существует, например, такой
1659	е места посадки гусей. Но вернемся к бизнесу	. Новые приложения компаний Alcat
1660	у достаточно прибыльному в последний год бизнесу	. По некоторым наиболее пессимист

Figure 5.2   Concordances of *business* in the RPC

N	Concordance		
123	зывал он нам и о том, что многие мелкие	"бизнесмены"	разорялись и нередко даже
124	во все это труд и средства. Но местные	"бизнесмены"	ухитрились приватизировать
125	мволична и многозначна — так называемые	"бизнесмены",	конечно, не занимались ст
126	площадь". Другие, более крупные	бизнесмены-	олигархи, желая избираться в
127	ехгранную пирамиду: бандиты, чиновники,	бизнесмены.	За каждым историческим проц
128	вью умытые президенты, полукриминальные	бизнесмены.	Но с ними нам вместе мирно
129	ь услышать голоса тех, для кого «хороший	бизнесмен»	-выражение из ряда «милосердн
130	емя как народом словосочетание «честный	бизнесмен»	воспринимается как анекдот, и
131	" партнерам. Так, претензии солнцевских	“бизнесменов”	исчисляются суммой в 30 м
132	в. Поиски остались безуспешными. Все те	«бизнесмены»,	дела которых мне стали из
133	штрафами всех, кто еще жив. То, что эти	«бизнесмены»	от государства часто ездят
134	мелкие рэкетиры с годами стали крупными	«бизнесменами»,	а нравы так называемого
135	ях (а в чьих же еще?) или уверенны что,	«бизнесмены»	нужны, а сложилось так, что
136	ство тотально- криминальных отношений, а	«бизнесмен»	и «преступник» практически с

Figure 5.3   Concordances of *businessman* in the CPOP

Table 5.3   Negative use of *businessman* in the CPOP

Collocation	Colligation	Semantic preference
крупный, средний	Count noun Adj-N	Size of earnings *крупные бизнесмены дающие взятки; крупный бизнесмен получивший за бесценок собственность*
No collocates, variable lexis	Count noun Adj-N	Crime, stealing *нечестные бизнесмены; теневые, полукриминальные бизнесмены*
российский отечественный русский	Count noun Adj-N	'Domestic' origin *… нынешние российские бизнесмены используют деньги как беруши*

N	Concordance		
209	констатирует Лосев. Постепенно западные	бизнесмены	учатся понимать россиян и даж
210	нологий и профессионализма, и российские	бизнесмены	это понимают. Некоторые из ни
211	ионального риска - - главы администраций,	бизнесмены,	банкиры. Последние очень х
212	ленцев отмечают практически все западные	бизнесмены,	- "позитивизм" - термин, хор
213	нального риска - - главы администраций,	бизнесмены,	банкиры. Последние очень хор
214	по заслугам. В понедельник испанские	бизнесмены,	их родственники, де Луна и М
215	лать, так это их образу жизни. Серьезные	бизнесмены,	Катя и Сергей еще по совмест
216	енности и веры в будущее. Многие крупные	бизнесмены,	которые не несли никакой соц
217	и целовать женщинам руку. Российские же	бизнесмены,	напротив, в самом начале вст
218	выными акциями управляют не только плохие	бизнесмены,	но и хамы. В общем, «подн
219	никами. Хороши они или нет, наши	бизнесмены,	но они наши бизнесмены. Друг
220	жны были бы что- то делать). Американские	бизнесмены,	озабоченные сложившейся ситуа

Figure 5.4   Concordances of *businessman* in the RPC

(state), *президент* (president), *власти* (authorities), *Гайдар* (Gaidar), *Чубайс* (Chubais), etc. Among the collocates we also find *прихватизатция* derived from the Russian verb *хватить/прихватить себе* meaning 'to grab something' (for oneself). The word is an example of a loan creation that

Table 5.4   Semi-technical use of *businessman* in the RPC

Collocation	Colligation	Semantic preference
немецкий российский израильский etc.	Count noun Adj-N	A person's origins
Мелкий, средний	Count noun Adj-N	Size of one's business

Table 5.5   Negative use of *privatisation* in the CPOP

Collocation	Colligation	Semantic preference
бандитский, грабительский, бесконтрольный, воровской	Adj+ N	Stealing, fraud, out-of-control phenomena
исполнитель, архитектор	N-Ngen	Actors; people responsible for implementation

N	Concordance		
699	и стали желудки рабочих, уволенных после	« приватизации »	и «реструктуризации». П
700	Да и статистика упорно показывает, что с	приватизацией	производство отечественно
701	ации ? Кто- то уточнил вслух: «Преступной	приватизации »	. Лукашенко усмехнулся: «И
702	й... В воздухе повисли слова «изъятие» и	«приватизация»	, запахло серой, дефолтом
703	эшелонах власти — вот еще одно наследие	"приватизации"	по Кажегельдину". У
704	а «ай- кью» видит связь между проведенной	приватизацией	и тем, что народ не хоче
705	нать, что «реформы», «реструктуризации»	«приватизации»	и прочее, что ныне на слу
706	—неприятное или неприемлемое. Напр.: 1.	« приватизация »	вместо «грабеж»; 2. «реф
707	говых перерабатывающих предприятий. Ну а	приватизация	, объявленная "рыжим Толико
708	птимизма: так, приход на НТВ архитектора	приватизации	Коха и одного из ее главн
709	стоит на страже чубайсовской бандитской	приватизации	народного достояния. Вот
710	оры- камикадзе пригласили поучаствовать в	приватизации	(на самом деле в мародерс

Figure 5.5   Concordances of *privatisation* in the CPOP

follows the trend of 'borrowing into the low/colloquial register' (Krysin, 2004: 12). Used in highly colloquial contexts, it can be translated into English as *privatisation + stealing*, *grabotisation* or *piratisation*.

It should be noted, however, that although these collocational tendencies are sufficient for making an observation about the role of the loanword in the negative evaluation of the political Other (Gaidar and Chubais are politicians from the ruling government), they do not cover all aspects of its local textual function. Some of the variable lexis from concordance profiles and further co-text indicate a forceful and deliberate action, destructive and illegal, which was allegedly planned and carried out by the ruling government (Table 5.5; Figure 5.5). A qualitative

study of whole text and intertextual links is necessary to support the analysis of these layers.

The derivative privatisational

As can be expected, the derivative from the loanword *privatisation* – the adjective *приватизационный* – also displays an association with words that have negative deontic values (Table 5.6). Apart from the nouns listed in Appendix 2, the Adj-N pattern with this derivative is also instantiated by such words as *комбинация* (scheme), *разбой* (robbery), *растащиловка* (pilferage). These nouns, although infrequent, can be included in the same semantic set as *афера* (swindle), and provide additional support for the interpretation that *privatisational* has a distinctly negative connotation in this discourse.

In the RPC, there are also examples of negative use (approximately 35 per cent of all instances). However, the majority of concordances point to the semi-technical use of this loanword in the sense of 'economic action' (Table 5.7; Figure 5.6).

The loanword manager

This loanword has fewer pejorative collocates in comparison to the profiles of *privatisation*, *business* and *oligarch* in the CPOP. The lexis used to describe negative deontic values associated with these loanwords, such as *бандиты* (bandits), *мошенники* (fraudsters) and *спекулянты* (profiteers), can be found only towards the bottom of the collocational list.

Table 5.6   Negative use of *privatisational* in the CPOP

Collocation	Colligation	Semantic preference
затеи, бумажки, афера (variable lexis: *передряги, комбинация, растащиловка, разбой*)	Adj-N	stealing, destruction … *уцелевших после приватизационного разбоя* … … *оставшаяся на предприятии после всех приватизационных передряг* …

Table 5.7   Semi-technical use of *privatisation* in the RPC

Collocation	Colligation	Semantic preference
итоги, акты, результаты	N-Ngen	Results of privatisation
именной, ваучерный	Adj-N	Type of privatisation (characteristics)

N	Concordance	
313	и продать ее можно любому. Ваучерная приватизация	-- то есть приватизация за
314	ле и «средства от продажи активов». Если приватизация	и есть оная продажа, то все
315	ь. Можно слить с Внешторгбанком. То есть приватизация	может быть заявлена по част
316	му. Ваучерная приватизация - - то есть приватизация	за именные, не подлежащие п
317	опыта и отечественных реалий. Заметьте, приватизация	в нефтяной отрасли прошла т
318	волической точкой была смерть Сталина. И приватизация	фактически началась не с Чу
319	оступа всех потенциальных инвесторов; — приватизация	государственных обязательств
320	в украинские реалии. В конце концов приватизация	была приостановлена. А по и
321	ли. Тем более что в это время началась приватизация	крупнейших ЦБК. За этим мог
322	а мы не сильно- то и поменялись. - Но приватизация	-- это не только и не столь
323	а гроши распродали! - - Номенклатурная приватизация	началась гораздо раньше пере
324	ельства... Не поймите меня превратно: приватизация	незавершенки - дело, безусло
325	результаты реформ? Несомненно! А чековая приватизация	здесь опять- таки ни при чем
326	еприватизация и пр. С.Тулуб сообщил, что приватизация	будет продолжаться, причем о
327	а счет прямых инвестиций. По сути, та же приватизация	, только без упоминания этог
328	невероятным. Действительно масштабная приватизация	, как единственное средство
329	собственности, в том числе известная нам приватизация	, теоретически должен повышат

Figure 5.6   Concordances of *privatisation* in the RPC

Moreover, as shown in Appendix 2, *manager* forms collocations with such adjectives as *профессиональный* (professional), *главный* (main, top), *удачливый* (successful), *талантливый* (gifted) and *эффективный* (effective/efficient), all of which are likely to be used to describe a state of affairs in a positive way. However, further examination of the co-text indicates that in the majority of instances the labels *manager* and *management* are given to those who are believed to be stealing or cheating people out of their rights, who either do not work or have undeservedly high earnings, or are the politicians held responsible for the destructive effects of the economic reforms. The last point is supported by a strong semantic preference for political issues shown by the top collocates *политический* (political), *Чубайс* (Chubais), *коммунист* (Communist), *чиновники* (officials) and *федеральный* (federal) (Tables 5.8 and 5.9). Against this norm of negative deontic values ascribed to *manager* (the negative semantic prosody is observed in 80 per cent of all instances), it becomes evident that the collocations *эффективный менеджер* (efficient manager) and *главный менеджер* (top manager) are used ironically.

Similar trends can be observed in the case of the noun *менеджмент* (management) (Figure 5.7).

In the RPC, the loanwords *manager* and *management* are used neutrally to refer to a person or group responsible for running an organisation (Figure 5.8 and Table 5.10).

The loanword default

Default is the 'youngest' among the loanwords examined in this study. It refers to the event that took place in August 1998, when the

Table 5.8 Negative use of *manager* in the CPOP

Collocation	Colligation	Semantic preference
Топ, главный	Count noun Adj-N	High-ranking posts
Variable lexis, no frequent recurrent patterns	Count noun Adj-N	Effectiveness, potential

Table 5.9 Negative use of *management* in the CPOP

Collocation	Colligation	Semantic preference
высший политический топ	Group noun Adj-N	Political issues, high-ranking posts (see concordance below)
No collocates, lexis is variable	Group noun N-Ngen	High earnings *сказочные оклады менеджмента; огромная зарплата*
N-1 No collocates; variable lexis: *обобрать расхищать*	Group noun N + V	Stealing, fraud *менеджмент обобрал рабочих недееспособность и недобросовестность менеджмента*

N	Concordance
1	л которой превышает 120,0 млрд. рублей. А менеджмент РАО «ЕЭС России» безвозмездно
2	не вкладывал! Более того, так называемый менеджмент самым бессовестным образом рас
3	льшие прибыли и огромные зарплаты высшего менеджмента РАО «ЕЭС России». Те
4	лизации этой реформы никто, кроме высшего менеджмента РАО «ЕЭС России», не выиграе
5	ь куда более высокой, чем ответственность менеджмента энергокомпании. Авар
6	вским СМИ, если приоритетом его маркетинг- менеджмент является борьба за власть.
7	контроль Мозырского НПК и "антикризисного менеджмента" в компании, осуществляемого
8	зала газета, 400 представителей "высшего менеджмента" этой прибыльной конторы мог
9	выше себестоимости при сказочных окладах менеджмента, иностранными инвестициями не

Figure 5.7 Concordances of *management* in the CPOP

government failed to pay its debts and announced default on all its obligations. Predictably, the collocational profile lists *August* as a top content collocate, followed by such grammatical collocates as the prepositions *до* (before) and *после* (after). The negative evaluation can be gleaned from all the concordances but would be difficult to demonstrate through co-occurrence tendencies alone. The collocates do reveal the semantic preference for 'negative economic consequences' however, as can be seen from the co-occurrence with *банкротсво* (bankruptcy), *изъятие* (confiscation) and *девальвация* (devaluation). It is also

N		Concordance	
386	разование или MBA. Кандидату в бренд-	менеджеры	необходимо хорошо знать другие
387	ых идеях, посредством реализации которых	менеджеры	обретают необходимый опыт. Во-
388	з опыта своей повседневной деятельности.	Менеджеры	по продукции или региональные
389	сложных задач в работе продавца. Многие	менеджеры	по сбыту уже научились эффекти
390	. американские высшие мене высшие менед	менеджеры	положили положили стратег страт
391	ртии. Одна. Однако при э при эт этом мен	менеджеры	понимают понимают, что во, что
392	ай". Пытаясь повлиять на мнение клиента,	менеджеры	порой выбирают ошибочные линии
393	стараемся не обращаться, для этого есть	менеджеры	рангом ниже. -- А Гейтс как
394	шь на двух наиболее крупных предприятиях	менеджеры	сталкиваются со значительными т
395	в переходном периоде, предприниматели и	менеджеры	рассматривают плановый подход к
396	Менеджеры по продукции или региональные	менеджеры	становятся менеджерами по взаим
397	языков. Что касается возраста, то бренд-	менеджеры,	как правило, люди не старше 3
398	лько лет, что у нас работают иностранные	менеджеры,	компания добилась заметного п
399	внедрения CRM, определить круг лиц (топ-	менеджеры,	консультанты, руководители про
400	ов ресурсов. сурс. наконец, менед,	менеджеры,	которые, которые уже пр уже п
401	Таким образом, с этой точки зрения все	менеджеры,	несмотря на различие их техни
402	специалистами будут администраторы, т.е.	менеджеры,	осуществляющие изменения. Упра
403	бизнес обычно строится на личных связях.	Менеджеры,	отвечающие за продажи, в боль

Figure 5.8 Concordances of *manager* in the RPC

Table 5.10 Semi-technical use of *manager* in the RPC

Collocation	Colligation	Semantic preference
N+1 *предприятие, банк, бизнес-клуб*	Count noun N-Ngen	Titles *менеджер 'Двины'* *менеджер нового алюминиевого гиганта*

interesting to observe the semantic preference for words denoting deliberate action (Table 5.11; Figure 5.9). In the light of these tendencies, *default* may represent something more than a destructive economic event in Russia's recent history for members of the opposition discourse – it also appears to be an action carefully planned and carried out by the ruling government (… *дефолт прошел под управлением Кириенко; методом дефолта организованного правительством*).

In the RPC, *default* is infrequent and most instances refer to the specific event that took place in August 1998 (Table 5.12). However, comparison of the summary tables also reveals a noticeable difference. Whereas in the CPOP *default* displays the above-mentioned semantic preference for words denoting deliberate action (*организовать, оформить дефолт* – to organise, to stage a default) functioning as an object of a clause, in the RPC there are examples where the loanword is used as a subject: *дефолт наступает* (default sets in), *дефолт разразился* (default broke out) and *дефолт угрожает* (default threatens). In this way, while the loanword is associated with negative phenomena in both corpora, texts in the RPC seem to de-emphasise or disregard the social actors

Table 5.11   Negative use of *default* in the CPOP

Collocation	Colligation	Semantic preference
до, перед, во время	Count noun Prep + N	Period of time, an event
дефолт 1998 года	Count noun Noun + object	Specific dates
организовать, устроить, оформить, объявить, инициировать	Count noun Verb + object	Action directed at organisation, creation and implementation
Variable lexis	Count noun N-Ngen	Organisation; names of top government officials *… на обломках дефолта;* *методом дефолта;* *дефолт имени Кириенко*

N	Concordance
1	трого Киндера определили. Он-то и оформил дефолт да еще звание национального героя
2	ас и пожинаем. Одно их них - прошлогодний дефолт и неспособность России оплачивать
3	пособна выдержать не только смену власти, дефолт или наезд налоговиков, но прямое п
4	плохо лежало, и еще немножко, а под конец дефолт объявила. Это, значит, когда все ц
5	зъятие банковских вкладов, приватизация и дефолт проведены Семьей исключительно из
6	в робко так о дефолте 1998 года напомнил: дефолт прошел под управлением менеджера К
7	ода "прихватизаторы". И они же устраивали дефолт, ваучерный грабёж, инфляцию и проч
8	вилась и информация о том, что в ответ на дефолт, жесткую позицию по реструктуризац
9	дураков держат или не понимают, что любой дефолт, кризис или банкротство имеет как
10	даже вражеские радио прогнозируют для нас дефолт, но нашим «реформаторам» ПРАКТИКА
11	есловутый ваучер, рынок ГКО и последующий дефолт, рядом со словосочетанием «реформа
12	в и Россию будет ожидать новый финансовый дефолт. Российский союз предпринимателей
13	цесс, например: изъятие, приватизация или дефолт. Тот же, кто думает по-другому, -

Figure 5.9   Concordances of *default* in the CPOP

Table 5.12   Semi-technical use of *default* in the RPC

Collocation	Colligation	Semantic preference
до, перед, во время	Count noun Prep + N	Period of time; an event
дефолт 1998 года	Count noun Noun + object	Dates; a specific event
Variable lexis	Count noun N + verb (default as a subject)	Verbs denoting 'negative consequences' *… а ровно через год наступает дефолт* *… четыре года назад в России разразился дефолт* *… России не угрожает дефолт*

N	Concordance	
1	В 2003 году Россию может ожидать новый	дефолт ...В 2003 году Россию может ожи
2	глава Росбанка отмечает, что выборочный	дефолт "все расставит на свои места и со
3	гациям эмитентов этих категорий возможен	дефолт (с разной степенью вероятности).
4	в последние два года. Девальвация и	дефолт августа 1998 года дали внутренним
5	й экономики оказались бы пострашнее, чем	дефолт августа 1998 года", - считает Г.
6	ке дефолт не грозит Российской экономике	дефолт в 2002г. не грозит.... ...До кон
7	то новое правительство Аргентины объявит	дефолт и откажется от искусственной прив
8	. В ближайшие год- два России не угрожает	дефолт . Такое мнение высказал советник п
9	ондЧетыре года назад в России разразился	дефолт . Тяжелый экономический кризис, вы
10	у «Эрмитаж», а ровно через год наступает	дефолт ... -- Общепит, я вам скажу, оч
11	ране угрожает самый крупный в ее истории	дефолт ...."Независимая газета" пишет
12	д. Эта продажа поможет компании избежать	дефолта - Qwest несет убытки уже восьмой
13	вив, что на сегодняшний день последствия	дефолта 1998 года в России полностью лик
14	STF, EFF, SRF получено $18,6 млрд. После	дефолта 1998 года в практики "жизнь взаймы" пришл
15	СШАразмер возврата на вложения в случае	дефолта по junk bonds составляет 82%, а
16	ижение учетной ставки ФРС уменьшает риск	дефолта по банковским кредитам и повышае

Figure 5.10   Concordances of *default* in the RPC

behind this economic event; default here resembles action of the elements, something which is beyond anyone's control (Figure 5.10). The instances of use in the CPOP, by contrast, construct and foreground the 'organisers' behind the August 1998 event.

The loanword voucher

Like *privatisation* and *default*, this loanword became another sad token of the social disaster brought about by the economic collapse. It was borrowed into the Russian language in 1992 when the State Committee for State Property Management of the Russian Federation headed by Anatoly Chubais set out to transform enterprises into profit-seeking businesses. The mechanism of such transformation was based on voucher privatisation where assets were to be distributed equally among the population. The noun *voucher* was used to refer to a privatisation token or cheque which corresponded to a share in the national wealth. As Ryazanova-Clarke and Wade (1999: 156) observe, the noun 'conveys none of the meanings of its English counterpart', and became widely used in colloquial discourse to refer to incomprehensible 'pieces of paper' (*бумажки*). Later, when the results of this form of privatisation proved to be useless for ordinary people, the word developed increasingly negative undertones, particularly transparent in its derivatives, such as *ваучерный* and *ваучеризация* (Krysin, 2004: 55).

In this context, it is not surprising that the loanword and its derivative exhibit an overwhelming semantic preference for negative phenomena in the CPOP (Tables 5.13 and 5.14; Figures 5.11 and 5.12). In the RPC, however, it is infrequent (25 instances)[10] and its use is predominantly

Table 5.13 Negative use of *voucher* in the CPOP

Collocation	Colligation	Semantic preference
афера (*обман, махинации*)	N + prep + N	Crime, manipulation of financial resources (see concordance profile)
пресловутый	Adj-N	Negative attributes

Table 5.14 Negative use of the adjective *voucher* in the CPOP

Collocation	Colligation	Semantic preference
приватизация, (variable lexis: *грабеж, передел*)	Adj-N	Nouns denoting forceful confiscation, deliberate breakdown … *жестокое время бандитско-ваучерного передела страны;* … *они же устраивали дефолт, ваучерный грабеж, инфляцию*

```
N                              Concordance
1   кономики, пришедшая на смену малопонятным    "ваучер,  либерализация,  макроэкономика".  В
2    экономики, как приватизация,    пресловутый  ваучер ,  рынок ГКО и последующий дефолт,    р
3   удто в микрофон:    —    А хоть и  пропил     ваучер ,  так свой!  Молчать!  Кто в доме хоз
4   о приватизацией    в СПЗ (помните чемоданы с  ваучерами  от Витька  —к Швидаку,  от котор
5   ерапия Гайдара,  откровенный  обман людей с   ваучерами  Чубайса  были  совершенно  неожидан
6   лялся Ельцину, что отдаст.    Надул Россию с  ваучерами,    врал,  что не было коробки с до
7   ледовать   ход  приватизации   и махинации с  ваучерами.   которые  Ельцин  ввел вместо  име
8   е очень  недоволен  приватизацией,   аферой с  ваучерами.  Люди  все  время  требуют провест
9   чем-то   ценным те    бумажки, что назывались  ваучерами?  Цена им та же, что конфетным ф
10  безнаказанно    надувший 145 млн. человек на  ваучерах и  приватизации,    породивший узкоке
11  внуки,  выросли в жестокое  время бандитско-  ваучерного  передела  страны  и полного  разр
12  за  мешок бумажек от Чубайса – пресловутых    ваучеров  –  металлургические    комбинаты  и н
13  естного  председателя  колхоза.  Посредством  ваучеров,   акций, "соглашений".    Это гранди
14  ия и активы приобретались      за бумажный сор  ваучеров,  которые  скупались  за  гроши на в
15   собственников,    видимо, имея в виду число  ваучеров,  которыми Чубайс осчастливил    рос
16  лей.  Скупая и перепродавая   крупные  партии  ваучеров,  чековые  инвестиционные   фонды  фа
```

Figure 5.11 Concordances of *voucher* in the CPOP

terminological (for example, when the collocation 'voucher privatisation' is used in economic contexts).

5.3 Loanwords and discursive strategies

This study has used special purpose corpora as repositories of contexts that provide insights into the ways connotations of the loanwords are realised in Russian media texts. Having identified the collocational

N	Concordance		
1	нуки, выросли в жестокое время бандитско-	ваучерного	передела страны и полного раз
2	ью небольшой группы лиц. Так как цели	ваучерной	приватизации не достигнуты, нео
3	фактически представляет собой новый этап	ваучерной	приватизации (когда материаль
4	твенного народа. Второй и третий этапы -	ваучерной	и денежной <приватизации> - в
5	ой цели". Одной из провозглашенных целей	ваучерной	приватизации была справедливост
6	алея "со щитом", отстояв белокаменную от	ваучерной	напасти, но для большой игры А
7	енной думой РФ может стать вторым, после	ваучерной	приватизации , эпохальным дост
8	сь замолвить слово в защиту святого дела	ваучерной	приватизации , праведные чувст
9	и грабители страны и народа приступили к	ваучерной	приватизации по Чубайсу, чтоб
10	ого сначала сами задушили его в зародыше	"ваучерной"	, а теперь за
11	недели следует объявить незаконными всю	ваучерную	приватизацию Чубайса и "аукц
12	корно терпевшее и "либерализацию цен", и	"ваучерную приватизацию",	и даже невыпла
13	ватизаторы". И они же устраивали дефолт,	ваучерный	грабёж, инфляцию и прочие пако
14	лго гадал, кому персонально обязан своим	ваучерным	счастьем. И вот слышу пана рек

Figure 5.12   Concordances of the adjective *voucher* in the CPOP

patterns in the CPOP, the next step is to examine the role of lexical surroundings in the construction of oppositional meanings. Previous corpus-assisted studies of discourse have demonstrated how collocational profiles can be used to reveal ideological assumptions by tracing associations that search terms entertain with other words. Following suit, below I examine what the co-occurrence patterns in the CPOP can tell us about the use of referential and predicational strategies.

By referential (or nomination) strategies I mean the linguistic means through which speakers classify social actors (van Leeuwen, 1996), and which in the context of this analysis allow the CPOP writers to express disapproval of the economic reforms and stigmatise those who were behind them. From this perspective, the collocation of *businessman* and *manager* with pejorative adjectives shows that these loanwords are used as ready-made labels for 'democrats'. Other loanwords are first transformed into agentive nouns (*privatiser*) or entered into collocations such as *hero of the default* or *sharks of business*. In labelling their political opponents, the patriotic opposition newspapers mix items from the contemporary political vocabulary dominated by crime metaphors (Chudinov, 2003) with invectives widely used in Soviet discourse. Here contemporary criminal slang is combined with popular labels for enemies dating back to the Communist editorials of the 1920s (Pöppel, 2007), such as *гнусный* (vile/base), *грабитель* (plunderer), *грабить* (to plunder), *грабительский* (plundering/predatory), *фашистский* (Fascist), *наглый* (impudent/audacious). The resulting semantic preference for words denoting criminal activities shows that social actors are predominantly constructed metaphorically as involved in illegal activities. Such use of crime metaphors points to the continuity of early post-Soviet discursive practices, when metaphors were found to be deployed primarily

for describing the negative side of politics and overall social situation (Ermakova, 1996).

Predicational strategies are commonly employed to assign evaluative and often stereotypical attributes to relevant social actors through implicit and explicit predicates (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001). For example, we find such structures as 'businessmen doing business on blood' or 'fooling people with vouchers' being used to portray opponents as involved in illegal activities or deliberately staging the economic crisis. The relative and possessive adjectives *олигархические, криминально-олигархические, ельцинские* found among collocates function as distancing devices, as they are used to indicate that the object belongs to certain 'Other' structures. Here manipulation of proper names through dropping initials and using possessive adjectives in collocations with criminal lexis is aimed at diminishing the importance of social actors. Furthermore, in such attributions of wrongdoing, political enemies are described as agents who intentionally and cynically carry out their actions.

To understand referential and predicational strategies we need to go back to the historical and social context in which they were used. It is not surprising that phenomena associated with business and the market economy are treated with suspicion in the discourse of the patriotic and largely pro-Communist press. The language of the Communist ideology included a long string of labels for mostly capitalist enemies, such as *bourgeoisie, terrorists, fascists, revanchists*, and so on (Andrews, 2011). As perestroika heralded the loss of the capitalist 'Other' for members of the Communist discourse community, many pejorative lexical items that were used in the Soviet period to blame the foreign enemy started to be used to stigmatise home-based opponents. In this new political context, loanwords develop negative evaluative overtones as they are used to refer to internal enemies of the Communists who symbolise the capitalist West for them.

5.4   Conclusions

Corpus linguistic techniques can help quantify discourse phenomena recognised in earlier discourse studies, that is establish their absolute and relative frequencies through the examination of the different linguistic means utilised to express them (e.g. see Baker et al., 2008). The analyses carried out here therefore do not merely establish that there are pervasive negative connotations (although this is a finding in its own right since earlier research is mostly based on proposals untested on

corpus data), but also reveal *how* they are manifested in language use, and to what extent.

The collocational profiles allowed me to distinguish among different meanings that the loanwords have developed in mainstream and oppositional periodicals. In the CPOP, both node–collocate pairs and collocations provide substantial evidence to support the claim that the loanwords display negative deontic potential. By contrast, in the RPC the loanwords are surrounded by lexis typical of the economic sphere, where it is habitual to talk about increase and decrease of market share, business initiatives, or government involvement in the economy. Here a semi-technical use of the loanwords is predominant. In line with Partington's observation that corpus technology 'can reinforce, refute or revise a researcher's intuition and show them why and how much their suspicions were grounded' (2003: 12), this comparative analysis provides insights that would be difficult to pin down without the support of quantifiable patterns of co-occurrence provided by the two corpora. In particular, the analysis confirms my own intuition and observations in qualitative sociolinguistic studies about contrasting connotations of loanwords in Russian. The negative connotations that emerged during my pilot study of individual texts are not idiosyncratic but reflect the underlying shared views of the patriotic opposition community.

The interpretation of these statistical patterns within the DHA framework established links between the use of the loanwords and political stance, confirming the importance of this methodology in political discourse analysis. The negative connotations are seen as resulting from attempts to redefine the meanings of the loanwords in the political struggle. The contrasting, opposing sets of referents in the two corpora point to the phenomenon of ideological polysemy (Klein, 1989): the situation when for A the word means A′, whereas for B it means B′. Since words with deontic meaning serve as carriers for thoughts, reactualising a specific negative or positive opinion every time they are used (Hermanns, 1994), every use of a loanword by members of the opposition discourse community serves as a 'token' that should remind their readers not only about the destructive consequences of the market reforms, but also who is to blame for them. It is in this sense that we can say that the loanwords are used as a lexical tool for setting the difference between US and THEM. They help shape the identity of this group in terms of its relationship with the Other, which is now represented by the 'reformers' and 'democrats'.

While the synchronic approach has allowed me to identify patterns of co-occurrence on the vertical axis of concordances, the horizontal

axis requires further attention. Cautious not to overinterpret the results of the collocational data analysis, I regularly drew up concordances to check my interpretations. This process revealed a number of constraints around the use of the loanwords in the CPOP at the lexico-grammatical and semantic levels. Having started with a loanword as the core, I soon found that in the majority of cases it is only an initial element in a string of words chosen together to perform a certain function. On the level of semantic preference, this involves a negative description of economy and business-related phenomena, events and people. However, statistical identification of collocation and subsequent grouping of collocates into semantic sets provide only limited evidence of the pragmatic role the loanwords may be playing in these texts. It became obvious that even extended concordances are not always sufficient for interpretation, and analysis of whole texts is necessary (Hunston, 2007), especially in instances where the loanwords are used metaphorically. The immediate lexico-grammatical environment is rarely the only or key explicandum in metaphor analysis, as more remote parts of the same text (such as headlines or lead paragraphs), or sometimes earlier texts, can set a platform for subsequent development of metaphors, and therefore hold the key for their interpretation. Consequently, in this synchronic analysis the examination of the textual surroundings remained rather superficial, as conclusions were mostly drawn on the basis of certain lexical signals, rather than emerging from an overall analysis of the relation of a loanword to the text where it occurs, or to other texts in discourse.

Furthermore, analysis of dominant collocational patterns inevitably tells an incomplete story of ideological undercurrents in discourse, and risks painting a homogeneous picture that glosses over conflicts and contradictions. Political scientists have repeatedly observed that the contemporary CPRF is espousing a contradictory combination of social-democratic, nationalist–socialist and Marxist–Leninist discourses, and the eclectic nature of Zyuganov's programme particularly stands out in this regard (Tsipko, 1996; March, 2003). From this perspective, the neutral and positive uses of the loanwords, which are rare in the CPOP, may be able to shed light on such trends. Extended concordances and reading of whole texts show that, contrary to expectation (Louw, 1993), some of these uses are not ironic. In corpus-driven investigations (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001), examples like this tend to be overlooked as exclusions from the rule. In the study of discourse, however, the importance of examining 'the remainder' (Baker, 2006: 84) is recognised. When using general language corpora such instances may lead

to uncovering of resistant discourses, whereas in the analysis of special purpose corpora in this book they present an opportunity to provide a fuller account of discursive strategies and explain how contradictions are played out rhetorically.

The next chapter presents such a study by examining paraphrases of the loanwords in the CPOP, paying particular attention to the uses of metaphor and irony.

6
Diachronic Study of Paraphrases

The analysis in the preceding chapter established divergent trends characterising the use of business-related loanwords in the patriotic opposition press on the one hand, and in the newspapers loyal to the Kremlin or supporting liberal parties on the other. The collocational patterns in the CPOP revealed the pejorative use of the loanwords, whereas in English and in the RPC the same loans were found to be predominantly used neutrally as semi-technical terms. Building on this evidence, this chapter will examine two interrelated research questions: How were these negative deontic meanings developed intertextually in the process of their negotiation in the newspaper texts? And how were the paraphrases of the loanwords, as vehicles of implicit and explicit intertextuality, employed in the construction of delegitimisation strategies? Here I adopt a qualitative and diachronic approach to the same large collection of chronologically ordered texts, which is expected to provide a window into the gradual discursive crafting of these new meanings. Such an approach also presents an opportunity to investigate the contrasting tendencies, which in this case are the instances where the loanwords were used in semi-technical contexts in the CPOP.

6.1   Studying the diachronic dimension

The analysis of changes in deontic meaning is based on the notion of norm negotiation. When a discourse community deals with new linguistic phenomena such as loanwords we can conventionally divide the process into implicit and explicit norm negotiations. In the case of loanwords in the Russian language, explicit norm negotiations were most prominent during the debates about their foreign status (Chapter 3).

Implicit norm negotiations are ubiquitous but not always recognised as such. As Breivik and Jahr (1989) point out, any linguistic utterance can be understood as a statement in the implicit ongoing negotiations of different and sometimes conflicting norms in a given discourse community. Our linguistic choices then signal a view on the particular norm in question; in other words, every time we speak or write we take a stance in the implicit norm negotiation.

From this perspective, we can see the emergence of a deontic meaning as a process of such negotiation, when particular associations are built up through paraphrases. In mainstream discourse in Russia after the 1996 presidential elections, represented here by the RPC, there is a consensus concerning the meanings of business-related loanwords. This consensus is the result of negotiations among the members of this discourse community in the early days of the post-Soviet system. In mainstream discourse, these loanwords are either positively accented or come without any specific deontic meaning. By contrast, the CPOP represents the discourse of the patriotic opposition movement. Within the framework of this group's ideology the loanwords acquire a different meaning and their use follows different implicit norms; recasting the concepts they stand for in a different light, they acquire a negative deontic value. Such semantic deviation becomes normative in the sense that members of this group have to abide by it in order to identify themselves and be recognised as group members. The new and deviant norm concerning the use of these loanwords requires, and is established by, paraphrases. By studying these chronologically ordered paraphrases, this chapter sets out to investigate how explicit and implicit negotiation of their meanings has led to the development of their deontic potential.

Each occurrence is interpreted as an intertextual reaction to previous occurrences, that is, diachronically. The emphasis is on the meaning of text segments documented in the history of the corresponding text segment tokens (Teubert, 1999). The method consists of analysing the relationship of a loanword or a phrase in which a loanword occurs to other phrases, including metaphoric constructions, and larger textual units which in some way explicate its meaning. Although analysis of intertextual features became a popular tool for studying 'voices' in Bakthin's sense, as yet few studies have used the concept of intertextuality to probe the emergence of meanings in a particular community of language users as evidenced by their written discourse, and in this way to understand more about the history behind the creation of connotations

and 'local semantic prosodies' that are typically unearthed through synchronic corpus linguistic analysis.

In reference to the second research question, the qualitative analysis of how evaluation is conveyed through the use of such essentially intertextual and destabilising tropes as metaphor and irony will contribute to our understanding of the loanwords' role in delegitimisation strategies. As current debates around the concept of semantic prosody have shown, a quantitative analysis of co-occurrence is poorly equipped to deal with the contextual embedding of pragmatic phenomena such as evaluation, and irony in particular, as they do not always have corresponding surface structures that can be computationally identified. For example, only some of the concordances analysed in the preceding chapter display such markers of irony (Kreuz and Roberts, 1995) in Russian, as expressions *с позволения сказать* (if one may say), *так называемый* (so-called), *конечно* (of course), *видите ли* (you see), *оказывается* (it turns out). However, even when these markers surface in concordances the interpretation of their role still requires access to much larger chunks of co-text. As Hutcheon points out, such markers can only act as triggers in terms of their '"meta-ironic" function, one that sets up a series of expectations that frame the utterance as potentially ironic' (1995: 154). Collocational lists also provide insufficient detail on metaphorical framing. So far the analysis has revealed that the loanwords are predominantly involved in metaphorical constructions within the domain of crime, as indicated by their adjacent collocates. More distant and less frequent collocates, however, point to the use of other metaphors that require a qualitative approach to unveil their role in the discursive construction of the Other.

In the critical analysis of ironic statements in political discourse, the intertextual dimension underlying Sperber and Wilson's theory of irony as 'echoic mention' deserves special attention. The 'echoic mention' insight highlights the referential property of utterances to something previously said. Unlike reporting, however, an ironic statement conveys information 'about the speaker's attitude to the opinion echoed' (Sperber and Wilson, 1995: 239). Such references to other pieces of language are not always identical reproductions of the original; they can be transformed through elaborations and paraphrases, as encapsulated in the notion of 'interpretative resemblance' (Sperber and Wilson, 1995). Below I demonstrate how many paraphrases of the loanwords incorporate instances[1] where irony can be understood as 'echoic mention'. The majority of such cases require a qualitative intertextual analysis to assess how echoes might relate to actual utterances. Such analysis

complements and extends the predominantly intratextual analysis of lexical co-occurrence.

To explore the intertextual and diachronic dimensions of irony and metaphor use, attention will be paid to relexicalisation, overlexicalisation and metaphor vehicle development. Relexicalisation refers to recasting of the same meaning in different terms using equivalents or super-ordinates (McCarthy, 1988) to imply that a new phenomenon is being denoted. A similar term 'rewording' is used by Fairclough (2001: 94): 'an existing, dominant, and naturalized, wording is being systematically replaced by another in conscious opposition to it'. Overlexicalization is defined by Fowler (1991) as 'the existence of an excess of "quasi syn-onymous" terms to talk about entities and ideas that are a particular problem or concern within a culture's discourse' (Fowler 1991: 84). It can be traced through highly expressive and exaggerated use of lan-guage which is employed for comic effect and/or to show indignation. Overlexicalisation is often characterised by 'textual synonymy' – the term used by Fairclough (2001) to refer to the fact that synonyms can be ideologically created within texts. Citing the following example: *Yet at the heart of the matter, it was an evil thing, an injustice, an aggression*, Fairclough observes that the listing of the three expressions ('evil', 'injus-tice', 'aggression') as attributive of *the invasion of the Falklands* suggests a relationship of 'meaning equivalence' between them. In this way, *evil*, *injustice* and *aggression* are said to be 'used interchangeably to refer to the invasion' (Fairclough, 2001: 80). Such textual synonyms do not follow traditional semantic rules, but are synonyms on the grounds that they constitute part of the discursive function of overlexicalisation.

The process of *vehicle development* takes place when the vehicle (or source) term of a metaphor is repeated, relexicalised, explicated and/or contrasted in the course of the discourse (Cameron, 2010). Connected vehicle terms may result not only in systematic metaphors in localised conversations, but also in systematic patterns across discourse communi-ties (Cameron, 1999). Similarly, in his longitudinal study of how Europe and the EU are discussed in the European press, Mussolf (2006) demon-strates how writers repeatedly develop, extend and refer intertextually to metaphoric mini-narratives or scenarios. Such metaphoric scenarios are realised textually but may not be transparent from reading of a single text. Rather, they are identified through the study of metaphoric rela-tions in a text that are then compared against other texts (Koteyko et al., 2008a). For example, a metaphor scenario that involves love and sex can be traced through representation of states as getting engaged, flirting, falling out of love with and divorcing each other (Mussolf, 2006).

The analysis presented below predominantly focuses on agreement paraphrases that create a group-specific consensus. The common macro-parameters of texts in the CPOP, such as their political orientation, discourse type and the topics discussed in them, make it highly probable that there is homogeneity of ideas. It is expected that members of this discourse are aware of previous texts, and endorse the conventional ways of speaking as they repeat previously coined expressions, add new lexicalisaions in the form of textual synonyms and relexicalise existing source domains. At the same time, the patriotic opposition discourse is always in dialogue with other discourses including the discourse it contests (Bakhtin, 1986). Such engagement with messages of political opponents is traced through disagreement paraphrases that contain explicit or implicit references to words and expressions used in the discourse of 'democrats'. The disagreement paraphrases indicate how oppositional meaning-making relexicalises the opponents' message – a relexicalisation that will serve as an anchor for subsequent negotiation and extension with the help of agreement paraphrases.

My selection of agreement and disagreement paraphrases is by no means exhaustive. The list of the loanwords analysed in the preceding chapter had to be cut down to include only *business, privatisation* and *default.* The rationale behind selecting these particular loanwords is as follows. The abundance of paraphrases of *business* and *businessman* is expected to enable a detailed analysis of minute changes in the definitions of these loanwords which were borrowed long before the perestroika times and were undergoing a 'revival' in the 1990s. The loanwords *default* and *privatisation* are interesting for the opposite reason: unlike *business* these words are 'new' borrowings belonging to the category of 'denoting new realia' (Chapter 4). I start with the earliest mention of each loanword in the corpus and proceed to texts written later,[2] drawing more recent variations of usage into analysis.

6.2   Analysis

Paraphrases of the loanword *privatisation*

Source: 'Pravda-5'   Date: 24 March 1998

One of the earliest uses of the loanword in the CPOP dates back to this text, although privatisation has of course an older history of use in this discourse (this is also indicated by the phrase in the headline 'the lawlessness continues'). This text contains a number of building/construction metaphors where the state and economy are conceptualised

as buildings ruined or broken down by the ruling government. In this context of assigning blame for the bankruptcy of large industrial enterprises, privatisation is metaphorically constructed as a criminal (and murderous) tool, and is used as part of the delegitimisation strategy that depicts the political opponents as killers:

> (1) Делается подобное конечно же для становления 'народного капитализма', новоявленные проповедники которого сначала сами **задушили его в зародыше 'ваучерной' 'приватизацией'**, а теперь **закапывают неродившегося младенца 'приватизацией' 'по блату'**. [Of course this is all being done to establish 'people's capitalism', whose new preachers firstly strangled it at birth with 'voucher privatisation', and are now burying the unborn baby with 'crony-infested privatisation'.]

The use of quotation marks around *voucher*, *privatisation* and *people's capitalism*[3] signals a dissociative attitude on behalf of the writer and simultaneously ascribes to the words the status of a vocabulary item used by the 'reformers-Westernisers'. Echoing (or mentioning rather than using) such key terms of their opponents, the writer disassociates himself from their discourse.

Below we will see how further texts make extensive use of the crime metaphor, as actions of the ruling government continue to be negatively evaluated through the development of the vehicles *crime*, *criminal tool/method* and *criminals*. The use of quotation marks for rhetorical purposes is another popular strategy in later texts, although they use quotations marks more sparingly than the above excerpt does.

Source: 'Pravda-5'   Date: 21 May 1998

Here agreement paraphrases include derivatives of the loanword *privatisation* and are engaged in metaphor vehicle development through repetition and relexicalisation (Cameron, 2010). The metaphor PRIVATISATION IS A CRIMINAL WEAPON is given lexical realisation through the phrase *the privatisational extinguishment* (that is extinguishment by the means of privatisation), whereas the status of a victim is now assigned to *factories*:

> (2) Почти все крупные мощные заводы и фабрики, за редчайшими исключениями, подверглись **приватизационному уничтожению**. Одна из последних **жертв** – знаменитый Ленинградский металлический завод. [Almost all the major high-output works and factories, with very few exceptions, underwent destruction through privatisation. One of the last victims was the famous Leningrad Metal Works.]

Furthermore, the agents of such action are now labelled by the agentive noun *privatisors*: [...] *когда приватизаторы уничтожали знаменитый 'Скороход'* (When the privatisors were destroying the famous 'Skorokhod'). Here the derivatives of *privatisation* are used to develop a metaphor scenario that originated in the same discourse community, which may explain why these creative transformations are treated as 'native' lexemes, that is not taken into quotation marks. The author then proceeds to make allusions to the Second World War, making a seemingly self-evident comparison ('nobody needs to be persuaded') of *privatisation* to Hitler's blockade:

> (3) А в том, что **'приватизация'** стала для промышленности Петрограда страшней войны, страшней гитлеровской блокады, – уже никого не надо убеждать. [Nobody needs any more persuading that 'privatisation' was more horrific for Petrograd's industry than the war and Hitler's blockade had been.]

The comparison extends and supports the use of war metaphors throughout this text, as can be seen from the following sentence, where the workers of the factory are said to have formed 'defence groups' (*Был создан Штаб защиты предприятия, организованы группы обороны ...*). Activating the war frame, such phrases raise certain expectations with regard to how other lexical items in the text, including the derivative *privatisators,* have to be interpreted. The use of war metaphors in this and later texts creates an overall scenario where the political competition with 'democrats' is represented as a defence of the Motherland against Hitler's invasion.

Source: www.eastview.com   Date: 30 June 1998

The text discusses a political event – a rejection of a bill by the lower house of the Duma.[4] The proposed law is conceptualised as a criminal plot between the government and 'money-bags and mafia criminal gangs' (*толстосумов и мафиозно-криминальных группировок*). Its proponents are consequently labelled the 'Godfathers' of the bill (*'Крестные отцы' законопроекта*). Throughout the text, the word *privatisation* is relexicalised as *прихватизация* (*pri**kh**vatisation*, see Chapter 5).

> (4) Даже первая, рыбкинская, Дума признала итоги '**ваучерной 'приватизации'** неудовлетворительной, запретила ее дальнейшее проведение и объявила: второй, денежный, этап **'прихватизации'** абсолютно незаконен и подлежит отмене. [Even the first Duma, the Rybkin one, found

that the results of the 'voucher privatisation' were unsatisfactory; they prohibited its further implementation and announced that the second, and monetary, stage of the 'prikhvatisation' (privatisation + grabbing) was absolutely illegal and should be rejected.]

Here the privatisation is said to have been carried out by politicians in the ruling government who have no concern for economic reforms and policies (as a technical use of *privatisation* would imply), but are solely interested in personal gain, i.e. the big profits they are reported to have gained from the sale of state enterprises to new owners. The use of the above discourse metaphors develops and foregrounds the scenario of a political plot and corruption, only briefly mentioned in (1) as 'crony-infested privatisation'. The names of Chubais and Gaidar are mentioned both explicitly and less so, as in the ironic statement 'the conductor of the voucherisation of the whole country', which alludes to a Soviet slogan 'Communism equals Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country':[5]

> (5) Ведь с недавних, приснопамятных времен безобидное слово **'ваучер' стало ругательным**, а небезызвестный проводник **'ваучеризации всей страны'** стал, без преувеличения, одним из самых нелюбимых в народе политиков. [It is only in the recent unforgettable years that the inoffensive word 'voucher' has turned into a swear word, and the not unknown person who carried out the 'voucherisation of the whole country' has become, without exaggeration, one of the politicians whom the people dislike most of all.]

Source: 'Pravda-5'   Date: 06 September 1998

This article refers to the alienation of the state property as '*чубайсовская приватизация*' (Chubais' privatisation). Jointly written by the editor of *Sovetskaya Rossiya* Valentin Chikin and the editor of *Zavtra* Alexander Prokhanov, the article contains the metaphors ECONOMY IS MACHINE and THE COUNTRY IS A HUMAN BEING as the authors continue to develop the scenario where Russia is personified as the victim of both murder and fraud. The villains in this scenario are now lexicalised as 'democrats'-monetarists':

> (6) Усилиями 'демократов' – монетаристов в России создана экономика, **выпившая из страны все соки**, уничтожившая весь потенциал развития, превратившая государство в банкрота. [In Russia, the efforts of 'democrat' monetarists led to the creation of an economy that sucked the

life from the country, destroyed all the potential for development, and made the state bankrupt.]

Source: www.sovross.ru   Date: 15 September 1998

This text signals that *privatisation* is not only a foreign word, but perhaps more importantly for this community, it is the word used by 'democrats'. To achieve this the author relies on disagreement paraphrases. In the following sentence, for example, the laudatory expressions from the opponents' texts, or in Sperber and Wilson's (1981) terms, echoic mentions of previous propositions, are woven into a chain of textual synonyms to create ironic stance and signal the speaker's negative evaluation:

> (7) … **'отец приватизации'**, 'стабилизатор финансов', главный любимец Запада, обладающий там огромным авторитетом и доверием, удачливый менеджер избирательных кампаний и, наконец, 'молодой реформатор'. [… 'the father of privatisation', 'stabiliser of finances', the chief favourite of the West who enjoys authority and trust there, the successful manager of election campaigns, and, last of all, 'the young reformer'.]

Source: www.zavtra.ru   Date: 29 September 1998

Here we learn about the meaning of the word *privatisation* from the speech of an 'ordinary Russian man'. In the opening paragraphs of this text, references to present-day realties are deeply interlaced with reminiscences of the past, constructing the parallels between those who 'defended' the 'people's constitution' in October 1993 and the soldiers who fought in the Great Patriotic War. A change in register from neutral to colloquial then brings us into the world of one such 'ordinary hero'. The following sentence contains what Bakhtin (1984: 73) calls a 'microdialogue' where the author (the narrator) uses the verbal manner of 'the Other' as a point of view:

> (8) Чего ты мне мозги пудришь – **приватизация, приватизация**, – кричал хозяин. – Как только какое-нибудь **темное дело**, так и слово **непонятное**. Скажи по-русски: **дележка**! И если после этой дележки у него оказался миллион, а у меня х .., значит, он мою долю хапнул. ['Who are you trying to fool? Privatisation, privatisation,' the owner shouted. 'As soon as there's some shady deal we've immediately got an unintelligible word. Say it in Russian: a carve up!' And if he ended up with a million after this sharing, and I had f*** all, it meant that he had nicked my share.]

As a result, the negative evaluation is achieved with the help of such speech 'within speech', which is at the same time also 'speech about speech, utterance about utterance' (Voloshinov, 1973: 115).

Source: www.zavtra.ru   Date: 27 October 1998

This article places the socio-economic reforms at the centre of all discussion through the enumeration of different negative phenomena, represented as direct consequences. The radicalism of the text makes it no surprise that it belongs to the CPRF leader Gennadiy Zyuganov. The text contains numerous instances of overlexicalisation, and is permeated by clichés and slogans, most of which are employed to develop the metaphoric scenario PRIVATISATION IS A CRIMINAL ACT:

> (9) Мы считаем, что прокуратура должна расследовать все это, и начинать с Чубайса, с его **воровской приватизации**, иначе конца и края этому никогда не будет. [We think that the prosecutor's office should investigate the whole thing, and should start from Chubais, from his thieving privatisation, otherwise there will be no end to this.]

A quick search of the CPOP shows that the collocation *thieving privatisation* is repeated seven times in later texts (without attribution). Zyuganov is undoubtedly an influential member in this discourse community as his name is frequent in the corpus – there are 288 references in total. The majority of these texts are based on interviews, although 12 texts also mention Zyuganov's name as an author. The influence of his articles can be traced through the repetitions of his phrases (for example, such expressions as '*мафиозные разборки*' (mafia rivalry) or '*денежные мешки*' (money sacks)) in later texts in the CPOP. Zyuganov's texts make it particularly transparent that expressions with the loanword 'privatisation' are used as special slogans that identify the programme that they stand for: to criticise the reforms initiated by the 'liberal' camp. His influence works in both directions: as a political leader, he not only provides new lexicalisations that become widely circulated and eventually entrenched in the discourse, but also recontextualises existing polyphonic political discourse as he makes use of other voices in a way that suits his own political direction (Chilton and Schäffner, 2002).

In this regard, it is interesting to consider another text from this corpus published on the website of *Sovetskaya Rossiya* on 14 September 1999. In this transcript of an interview, Zyuganov adds qualifiers to the

expression 'Chubais' privatisation', turning it into 'the criminal Gaidar–Chubais' privatisation', which is repeated by five later texts. Whereas authors of earlier texts represented the economy (1) or the country as victims of this crime (2), in Zyuganov's narrative the victim is the people, lexicalised as *народ*:[6]

> (10) Как этот человек действовал в годы **преступной гайдаровско-чубайсовской приватизации** и сам он за эти годы не превратился ли в денежный мешок, не разъелся ли он на народных слезах и народном горе? [How did this person act during the criminal Gaidar–Chubais' privatisation, did he turn into a money sack, did he profiteer off people's tears and people's grief?]

Although he continues to use crime and illness metaphors to portray the evils of 'yeltsinism', the focus is now on setting out a call for action. Here war metaphors play a prominent role, allowing representation of the political campaign as the liberation campaign of the Red Army:

> (11) Мы очень надеемся, что вновь отправятся в освободительный поход солдаты Отечественной, их дети и внуки. [We really hope that the soldiers of the Great Patriotic War together with their children and grandchildren will start another liberation campaign.]

Allusions to the Great Patriotic War constitute the core of Zyuganov's programme and permeate the slogans mentioned in this interview. Thus, we are reminded that the CPRF movement led by Zyuganov is entitled *За Победу!* (For Victory!) – referring to a political victory, but at the same time containing the capitalisation that may resolve the ambiguity in favour of the particular victory over Germany in the Second World War. Furthermore, one of the main slogans '*Вставай, страна огромная!*' is the first line of the 'Sacred War'[7] (*Священная война*) song.

   As we will see below, this text sets out the platform upon which further ideological statements will be developed implicitly through relexicalisation of metaphor vehicles as well as via direct quotations.

Source: www.pravda.ru   Date: 01 February 1999

The author of this text uses a metadiscursive commentary to spell out the negative connotation of *privatisation*:

> (12) В последние годы слово **'приватизация'** у россиян так или иначе ассоциируется с понятием **'жульничество'**. [The word 'privatisation'

has recently become associated in the minds of Russians with the concept of 'fraud'.]

The metadiscursive introduction co-creates a language norm, an unwritten invitation for future members of this discourse community to distance themselves from the loanword and use it with reference to all things negative. In the earlier text (5) the loanword *voucher* is subjected to the same kind of metadiscursive introduction.

Source: www.sovross.ru   Date: 08 May 1999

Continuing the trend of using colloquialisms to create affinities with the audience, the text aims to detail 'a history of stealing', and offers the following definition of privatisation: … **'приватизация'** *– это заурядный грандиозный* **хапок** [Privatisation is just plain robbery on a colossal scale]. As in (5), (7) and (10), this criminal act is attributed to Chubais, who is now given the ironic label 'the innovator' (echoing the laudative term used in the liberal press) and is represented as the main actor in the metaphoric scenario PRIVATISATION IS DESTRUCTION OF THE ECONOMY:

> (13) Все, что сделал этот 'новатор', – запустил на полную мощь механизм **тащиловки, названной 'приватизацией'**, **развалил** всю структуру связей и взаимодействия … [All that this 'innovator' did was to turn the plundering mechanism called 'privatisation' fully on, and break apart the whole system of connections and interaction …]

Source: www.sovross.ru   Date: 10 May 1999

Adopting the same building/destruction scenario that can be inferred from earlier texts, this text relexicalises the main actor responsible for the destruction as a 'democratic leader', which is used synonymously with the derogative derivative *прихватизатор*. The luxurious lives of such leaders are then contrasted with the 'slavery' of the workers, using the expression typical of Communist texts: *the toiling masses* (*трудящиеся*):

> (14) А демократический' руководитель (понимай – **'прихватизатор'**), **развалив производство**, гребет немерянные деньги и роскошествует, когда превращенный им в раба трудящийся еле сводит концы с концами. [After breaking up enterprises, the 'democratic' manager (i.e. 'the prikhvatiser'), is now making huge bucks and living in luxury, while the worker he turned into a slave can barely make ends meet.]

The following text repeats the derivative of *prikhvatisation* – the noun *prikhvatisors*. The familiar vehicle *thieves* (as part of the scenario PRIVATISATION IS A CRIMINAL ACT) is also repeated, whereas the metaphor of building is used in relation to economic destruction:

> (15) Иное дело – воры. Они **прихватизировали** по ценам в десятки и в сотни раз меньше стоимости, предприятия **разваливают и распродают**. [Thieves are a different matter. They grabbed (priKHvatised) enterprises for hundreds of times less than their actual value, and the enterprises are falling apart and being sold off.]

This text implicitly supports what has been said earlier about the connection between privatisation and the ruling government, as in (6) or (7) for example, and endorses the idea that privatisation is a 'criminal affair'. In order to enhance the credibility of his argument, the author resorts to the strategy of implicit opinion attribution by claiming that 'there are not many people in the country' who would not believe his proposition:

> (16) Немного найдется в стране тех, кто бы не считал **приватизацию преступной аферой**, уважал олигархов или поддерживал вечного отпускника президента. [There are not many people in this country who do not believe that the privatisation has been a criminal swindle, who respect the oligarchs or support the president who is forever on holiday.]

As far as the actors in the metaphoric scenario PRIVATISATION IS A CRIMINAL ACT are concerned, the text relexicalises the vehicle *criminals* with the nouns *oligarchs* and *racketeers*; it also repeats the vehicles *bandits* and *businessmen* already mentioned in the previous texts.

Drawing on the same metaphor PRIVATISATION IS A CRIMINAL ACT, this text (17) lexicalises the agents – the politicians in power – as *тузы* (aces), who are said to be 'fed' by the Chubais privatisation. (*Все нынешние тузы вскормлены* **приватизацией Чубайса**.)

The analysis of earlier texts, such as (1), (3) or (10), allows us to identify a number of direct and indirect citations in the current text, which is quoted at length below to demonstrate these intertextual resonances.

The usual suspects Chubais, Gaidar and Kokh are said to participate in 'it's-all-among-friends sharing out'. We also find phrases from Zyuganov's articles such as 'the anti-people constitution' and 'the large-scale robbing of the country':

(18) Но за спиной расстрел законно избранного парламента, прямое игнорирование волеизъявления народа, выраженного путём двух референдумов, самовольное, несогласованное ни с кем, изменение Закона о референдуме, проталкивание благодаря этому изменению при прямой фальсификации числа голосов антинародной конституции, узаконившей **приватизацию**, келейный, почти дружественный делёж в кабинете Коха и Чубайса промышленных объектов стоимостью в сотни миллионов и даже миллиардов долларов, а ценой в месячную зарплату младшего научного сотрудника советских времён. Но это не полный перечень всех действий по **массовому ограблению людей и страны**. [However, behind us we have the shooting down of the legitimate parliament and disdain for the will of the people as expressed in two referendums, as well as an unauthorised change to the law on referendums that nobody agreed to, which, coupled with vote fraud, resulted in pushing through parliament an anti-people constitution that legitimised privatisation. Another example of the underhand dealings is an amicable, it's-all-among-friends sharing out of the country's industrial property, worth millions and even billions of dollars, among the members of Kokh and Chubais' cabinet, who purchased the property for a trifling sum, the equivalent of the monthly salary of a junior research associate in Soviet times. And the large-scale robbing of the country and its people is not limited to the examples given.]

Here the loanword *privatisation* is allowed to stand on its own – without the immediate pejorative modifiers such as *criminal*, and without quotation marks. It is, however, used alongside other well-recited slogans and clichés which all have specific meanings for the members of this community. These clichés provide intertextual references to the earlier texts where *privatisation* was accompanied either by a metadiscursive commentary or negatively charged lexis, and in this way they may be sufficient to evoke the meaning of privatisation as an instrument in the 'robbing of the country'.

It is noteworthy that the ritualistic character of the above excerpt is due not only to the incorporation of recent texts. The text reproduces lexis of a Soviet vintage (e.g. *народ* is the key term to refer to the proletariat) and is packed with nominalisations such as *расстрел*,

игнорирование, изменение, проталкивание, делёж and so on, which serve to introduce preconstructed and taken-for-granted notions by erasing the coordinates of time and actors. Consequently, it is a good example of how, despite the occasional use of heretic linguistic tools, the patriotic opposition discourse continues to rely upon the authority of the Soviet past.

Source: www.sovross.ru   Date: 15 May 2001

Drawing on the metaphoric scenario PRIVATISATION IS A CRIMINAL ACT, or specifically, PRIVATISATION IS STEALING, this text repeats the vehicle 'prikhvatizors' and uses the reference to the proletariat (working people), as well as the Communist expression 'the toilers' or 'the toiling masses' to represent the victims:

> (19) В былые времена Чубайсы, Немцовы и прочие '**прихватизаторы**' общенародной собственности любили рассказывать рабочему люду сказки о 'народном капитализме'. [Chubaises, Nemtsovs and other 'prikhvatizors' of the national property used to tell the working people fairy tales about the 'people's capitalism'.]

Interestingly, the path metaphor popular in Soviet discourse (see Chapter 7), lexicalised as 'the right course of action', is used here to lend an ironic twist to the negative evaluation of the reforms:

> (20) По части оттеснения трудящихся от созданной им собственности Синюков идет верным курсом Гайдара – Чубайса. [As far as the task of distancing the toilers from the property they created, Sinyukov follows the right course of Gaidar and Chubais.]

Source: www.zavtra.ru   Date: 05 November 2001

Connection to other texts: reaction to *Остановить 'РЕФОРМЫ СМЕРТИ'*! (Stop 'the reforms of death'!)

   The text is an example of a letter to the editor, and is written by a group of senior army officers. As a reaction to an earlier letter of August 2001 discussed in the section on the loanword *business* below (45), the text continues the criticism of the 'death reforms' by focusing on their consequences for the Armed Forces. It extends the same topic through repetition of existing collocations such as *death reforms* or *criminal reforms* while also providing a range of new lexicalisations. Drawing on the same metaphoric scenario of crime as in (9), (15) or (18), the authors use *privatisation* without quotations marks (*итоги криминальной*

приватизации/the results of the criminal privatisation). Later it is para-phrased as 'the method of robbing the people':

(21) К сожалению, президент В. Путин в своем послании Федеральному собранию в январе этого года, по существу, поддержал **приватизацию** как **метод ограбления народа**. [Unfortunately, President V. Putin, in his address to the Federal Assembly in January this year supported priva-tisation as the method of robbing the people.]

Source: www.zavtra.ru   Date: 30 July 2002

The hyperbole and criminal metaphor in the title of this text 'Everybody is stealing!' (*Воруют... Воруют все!*) set the overall frame for interpreting the uses of the loanword *privatisation* in it. Describing the reforms as the main cause of stealing on the national scale, the author supplies a metadiscursive commentary that purports to reveal some well-known facts about how the loanword is currently used. The ironic undertones continue to be signalled by quotation marks, as well as through the use of the diminutive-pejorative suffix in '*словечко*':

(22) Иностранное **словечко 'приватизация'** в народе давно окрестили **'прихватизацией'**, а осуществивших ее 'демократов' – **'демокрадами'**. [The little foreign word 'privatisation' was turned into 'prikhvatisa-tion' by the people long ago, and the democrats who carried it out were called 'demokrads'.]

Here we have another example of a creative loan transformation – the word *демокрад*, where the root *-крад* is taken from the verb *красть* which means *to steal*. This creative hybrid can therefore be translated into English as *demothief* (*democracy* + *thief;* or thieves of democracy).

Source: www.sovross.ru   Date: 22 May 2003

To reinforce the by now popular cliché of this discourse that privatisa-tion is just an act of 'massive stealing', the text introduces a new term: *corporatisation* (*акционирование*):

(23) Готовящееся акционирование части белорусских предприятий не имеет ничего общего с разорительной для экономики и **грабительской российской приватизацией**, которую провели по рецептам Чубайса, Гайдара и Коха. [The upcoming corporatisation of some Belarus enter-prises does not have anything in common with the economically

destructive and rapacious Russian privatisation carried out according to the recipes of Chubais, Kokh and Gaidar.]

Later on the author reassures the readers that the people of Belarus did not yield to the power of the 'Russian oligarchs' and did not hand over their economy to the mercy of the 'prikhvatizors' (*на милость 'прихва-тизаторов'*). Here the words *corporatisation* and *privatisation* are used to indicate political allegiances: privatisation is stealing and is to be associated with the current Russian government, while positively connoted 'people's corporatisation' is the course of the economic reforms undertaken by the Communist president of Belarus.

Further texts from 2003 where this loanword occurs either repeat or relexicalise vehicles within the source domains of crime, war and building/destruction, which contributes to the gradual ritualisation of this discourse. As these paraphrases rely on the stock expressions reproduced above (*thieving/plundering/criminal/chubais privatisation* and so on) and do not introduce new metaphoric scenarios they will not be cited here. For example, such hyperbolic definition of privatisation as 'the most corrupt event ever' (*чубайсовская приватизация – самое крупное коррумпированное событие веков*) provides a creative and more radical relexicalisation, but is used in a text that repeats the vehicles from the source domains illustrated by earlier excerpts. It is also worth noting that both the loanword and its derivatives continue to be used without quotation marks in these later texts. It seems that there is no longer a need to point out that *privatisation* is a borrowed term and attribute it to the speech of the Other. The loanword has developed into a full-blown stigma word that has clearly defined norms of use within this discourse community.

Overall, the analysis of paraphrases corroborates the earlier finding that this loanword, used interchangeably with *prikhvatization* and the expression 'thieving privatisation', is a definite stigma word in the patriotic opposition discourse. New members of this discourse community strive to relexicalise the connection of *privatisation* to their opponents in a more radical, and more pejorative way than had been done by their predecessors. In doing so, they repeat, extend and develop the metaphors PRIVATISATION IS A CRIMINAL TOOL and PRIVATISATION IS A TOOL OF DESTRUCTION, linking the loanword to a range of negative social and economic phenomena. By the year 2003 we have a history of recontextualisations that illuminates the negative semantic prosody of this loanword and shows how it had been employed as part of various delegitimisation strategies. As a result, in 2003 privatisation is no longer

marked as a word borrowed from another discourse but functions as an internal cliché – a sum of meanings previously elaborated by discourse members which is now used for the articulation of mythical concepts.

Paraphrases of the loanword *default*

Source: www.duel.ru.   Date: 01 September 1998

In this text the loanword *default* is used as an economic term to denote a failure to meet financial obligations. It co-occurs with terms commonly used in economics such as *export, state bankruptcy* and *property*, among others.

> (24) Почему мы не можем просто отказаться платить? Потому что, во-первых, к нам будет применена процедура государственного банкротства, или **дефолта** (default), то есть выручка от экспорта и недвижимость за границей будут конфискованы … [Why can we not simply refuse to pay? Firstly because we will be subject to the procedure of state bankruptcy, or default, which means that profits from export and overseas property will be confiscated …]

Source: www.zavtra.ru   Date: 9 November 1999

By contrast, this article links *default* to the loanword *privatisation* which, as has been demonstrated in the preceding section, is frequently employed by members of the patriotic opposition discourse to stigmatise the activity of their opponents. Furthermore, here we have an expression 'default named after Kirienko' – an ironic statement drawing on the practice of naming places, events and discoveries after prominent figures to highlight and commemorate their achievements. The tradition was widespread during Soviet times when most streets and towns were given names commemorating revolutionaries, statesmen and intellectuals. Here '*default named after*' creates a collocational clash and subverts reader expectations as typical collocates of 'named after' are words denoting some kind of achievement:

> (25) Огромное количество активов было выведено из-под контроля РФ и в ходе 'приватизации'. Как результат – непрерывная череда фактических государственных банкротств образца […]1994-го (обвал финансовых 'пирамид') и 1998-го (**дефолт имени Кириенко**) годов. [A lot of assets were removed from Russian Federation control during 'privatisation'. The result was a series of state bankrupcies such as […] in 1994 (the collapse of financial pyramids) and 1998 (the Kirienko default).]

As a result, negative evaluation is achieved through the incongruity created by the evocation of extremely positive phenomena of the Soviet past alongside the representation of the economic crisis. The later texts (26) and (32) follow this discursive strategy.

Source: www.duel.ru   Date: 14 March 2000

In this text, *default* and *privatisation* are defined as words used by the ruling government to disguise their criminal actions. Note again the play on the contrast achieved through the use of the Soviet exhortation 'the matter of honour and valour' and the metaphorical representation of Russia as a victim of robbery:

> (26) В период, когда **грабить эту страну стало делом демократической чести и доблести**, не каждый правильно воспринял перестройку. […] … выдвинул теорию, согласно которой новый бог по прозвищу Рынок воровать не только разрешает, но и рекомендует, важно лишь правильно обозвать этот процесс, например: изъятие, **приватизация** или **дефолт.** [In the period when it became a matter of democratic honour and valour to rob the country, not everybody understood perestroika correctly. […] a theory according to which the new god called 'The Market' not only allows but recommends stealing. It is only a matter of giving the correct name to this process, such as 'confiscation', 'privatisation' or 'default'.]

Whereas texts (3) and (13), for example, use parallelism and over-lexicalisation for weaving *privatisation* with pejorative labels and crime metaphors, here *default* is entered into the chain of equivalence with *privatisation* itself.

Source: www.duel.ru   Date: 30 May 2000

This text further removes any traces of semi-technical use by representing the 1998 crisis as an act of stealing carried out by 'The Family' – the ruling political elite. Referring to Firth's well-known dictum, we can observe a gradual gathering of the company that this loanword will keep in 2003. One of the prominent members of this ensemble is the verb *хапать* (to grab, to steal), which we have encountered earlier as a noun (*хапок*) in the description of *privatisation*:

> (27) Семья **хапала** все, что плохо лежало, и еще немножко, а под конец **дефолт** объявила. Это, значит, когда все цены втрое возросли. [The Family grabbed everything that was not securely in place, and a little bit

more, and at the end announced the default. That is when all the prices increased threefold.]

Source: www.duel.ru   Date: 5 December 2000

As in the preceding text, the readers are informed that the default was deliberately staged by the ruling government. The following ironic passage creates textual equivalences between the economic terms *default* and *inflation* on the one hand and the negatively valenced *voucher robbery* and *tricks* on the other, all of which appear to be actions implicitly attributed to 'the prikhvatisors'. Note also the lexical marker of irony *господа* (messieurs) commonly used in Communist texts to express contempt and derision towards class enemies (Pöppel, 2007):

(28) Оказывается, зарплаты работникам и пенсии нищим старушкам не давали проклятые коммунисты, а вовсе не господа **'прихватизаторы'**. И они же устраивали **дефолт**, **ваучерный грабёж**, инфляцию и прочие **пакости**. [As it turns out, the workers' wages and the poor old ladies' pensions were suspended by the damned Communists, not by messieurs 'prikhvatisers'. It was also they who organised the default, the voucher robbery, inflation, and other nasty tricks.]

The attribution and subsequent negative evaluation are achieved through contradiction between what is literally said and what may constitute the actual state of affairs known to members of this discourse community. As Berntsen and Kennedy (1996: 21) explain: 'the contrast between the literal statement and the shared background knowledge can be a way of specifying an attitude'.

Source: www.sovross.ru   Date: 20 February 2001

Following the tradition set in the earlier texts, such as (10) for example, the loanwords *default* and *privatisation* are connected here to politicians in power through collocation with possessive adjectives derived from their proper names. Through the repetition of the same verb pattern, parallels are constructed between the already frequently exploited metaphor PRIVATISATION IS A CRIMINAL TOOL [USED BY THE RULING GOVERNMENT] and the 1998 default. As a result, just as in the above text (28), the loanword is used to refer to yet another element of the 'democrats' plot:

(29) Рыбаки выстояли в чубайсовской приватизации, не рухнули при гайдаровском обвале цен, смогли уцелеть и после **кириенковского дефолта**.

[The fishermen did not surrender during the Chubais privatisation, did not collapse during Gaidar's plummeting prices, and managed to survive the Kirienko default.]

Source: www.zavtra.ru   Date: 05 November 2001

Here the expression 'by the method of default' is also associated with the metaphor PRIVATISATION IS A CRIMINAL TOOL used in earlier texts, such as (1) and (22). Default is therefore yet another method of 'robbing the people' employed by the Yeltsin government:

(30) Народ был трижды ограблен режимом Ельцина за последние 10 лет, не считая так называемой приватизации. […] а затем – **методом дефолта**, организованного правительством Кириенко. Ограбление народа продолжается. [The people have been robbed three times by the Yeltsin regime over the last ten years, not taking into account the so-called privatisation. […] and then – by the method of default, organised by the Kirienko government. The robbery of the people continues.]

Source: www.zavtra.ru   Date: 01 May 2002

Similarly, this text continues to elaborate on the theme of 'the massive deception of the people' and weaves the loanword into an overlexicalisation chain together with *voucher*, *privatisation* and *oligarchs*:

(31) И, конечно, главный среди равных – председатель правления РАО госп. Чубайс […] безнаказанно надувший 145 млн. человек на **ваучерах** и **приватизации**, породивший узкокелейной приватизацией кучку 'олигархов', творец пирамиды ГКО, завершившейся дефолтом 1998 г. [And, of course, the first among equals was the chairman of RAO, Mr Chubais […] who got away with fooling 145 million people with vouchers and privatisation, and created a handful of 'oligarchs' with his behind-the-scenes privatisation. He was also the creator of the GKO financial pyramid, which resulted in the default of 1998.]

Source: www.sovross.ru   Date: 20 March 2003

The agreement paraphrase of *default* in this text makes explicit the ironic presupposition contained in the earlier expression 'default named after' (25), as Kirienko is now labelled 'the hero':

(32) А **герой дефолта** С.Кириенко? Может быть, он вернулся в Нижний Новгород к своему **бизнесу**? [And the hero of the default S. Kirienko? Maybe he went back to his business in Nizhnij Novgorod?]

Source: www.sovross.ru   Date: 4 September 2003

In this text, we find one of the most explicit representations of default as a planned action. The author denies the existence of a 'spontaneous cause', representing default as 'just plain robbery' (*А пахнет здесь самым элементарным воровством или грабежом*). Such a scenario also allows the writer to specify the participants ('oligarchic associations') and in this way use the loanword to attribute negative qualities to the Other):

> (33) … любой дефолт, кризис или банкротство имеет как раз не стихийную причину, а созданную, осуществляемую в мозговых центрах крупнейших олигархических объединений США. [Any default, crisis and bankruptcy does not arise spontaneously, but is manufactured in the think tanks of the biggest oligarchic associations in the USA.]

The history of paraphrases of this loanword allows demonstration of the gradual process of 'semantic engineering' undertaken by members of the patriotic opposition discourse in 1999. Analysis of the norm negotiation process has shown how the CPOP authors began to associate the meaning of *default* with negative deontic values by creating chains of equivalence with negatively charged lexis and the existing stigma word *privatisation*. Gradually but consistently these equivalences were supported and extended through agreement paraphrases in later texts, as *default* was being entered into collocations with crime and building/destruction metaphors, and linked to allegedly planned actions of the ruling government.

Paraphrases of *business* and *businessman*

Source: www.duel.ru   Date: 01 December 1998

This text discusses the time when the economic reforms were introduced: '*Его история типична для наших **'бизнесменов'** первой волны*' [His story is typical of our first-wave 'businessmen']. It proceeds through the pattern of contrasting the recent Communist past with 'the time of democratic reforms':

> (34) Надо заметить, раньше за покупку и перепродажу ворованного можно было в тюрьму угодить. Теперь при 'рыночных отношениях' такого не происходит … [It has to be pointed out that previously you could end up in prison for buying and reselling stolen goods. Now that we've got 'market relations', that doesn't happen.]

The theme of business as crime is gradually developed by subsequent texts that enumerate new types of illegal activities as referents of this loanword.

Source: www.duel.ru   Date: 16 March 1999

In this text, references to the past go back to the 1920s as the author introduces a comparison with what he sees as a similar period in the history of Russia – the time of the New Economic Policy (NEP). The nostalgic narrative constructs parallels with the present by labelling the economic reforms as 'the time of stealing':

> (35) Все понимали, что это время хапания, объегоривания друг друга не может длиться долго. […]Вот это же думаю я и о сегодняшнем ельцинизме, 'рынке' для березовских и ходорковских. [Everybody understood that this time of stealing and fooling each other cannot last long. […] I think the same is true about today's yeltsinism, 'the market' for berezovskys and khodorkovskys.]

This digression into history points to the root of the negative deontic meaning of *business* and *businessmen* employed in the CPOP texts as we are told that the people who did the 'fooling' were referred to as 'businessmen'.

Source: www.sorvoss.ru   Date: 10 May 1999

A small-scale business is indirectly labelled *спекуляция* (profiteering) through the use of explanatory brackets. A middle-sized business is in turn rendered *shuttle trade* with the same rhetorical move:

> (36) Ну список единящихся, пожалуй, тайны уже не составляет – движение 'В поддержку независимых депутатов' (независимых от народа – если судить по мерам охраны), 'Союз поддержки и содействия малому и среднему **бизнесу**' (**челночеству и мелкой спекуляции**). [Well, the list of those who are coming together is probably no longer a mystery: the movement 'In Support of Independent Deputies' (independent from the people if you look at the security measures taken), 'The Union in Support of Entrepreneurship and Cooperation with Small and Medium Business' (i.e. in support of the shuttle trade and profiteering).]

Source: www.sorvoss.ru   Date: 04 September 1999

Here we learn that businessmen are also characterised by a certain 'inventive' streak, which allows them to take money by fooling others.

The ironic disapproval on behalf of the writer is signalled by the distancing quotation marks around the loanword, as well as by the Russian verb *ухитряться* which translates as *to manage to do something*, that is to reach a goal that is both difficult and desirable:

> (37) Но местные **'бизнесмены'** ухитрились приватизировать часть бывшего артековского пляжа … [But the local 'businessmen' managed to privatise a part of the former 'Artek' beach …]

This is followed by a short summarising sentence without a subject that points to the roots of the situation: '*Рынок, капитализм, реформы по-украински*' [Market, capitalism, the reforms Ukrainian style].

Source: www.sovross.ru   Date: 02 October 1999

Here a disagreement paraphrase of the loanword *business* is used to recontextualise the phrase 'honest elections' which is attributed to the ruling government. When interpreted against the earlier extremely and exclusively negative uses of the loanword in the CPOP as well as in earlier Soviet discourse, the word combination *честный бизнес* stands out as incongruous. The collocational clash is signalled by the author himself as he provides a contextual synonym for this phrase in the form of an explicitly oxymoronic expression 'fair robbery':

> (38) Из уст власть имущих слова 'честные выборы' звучат как 'честный **бизнес**' или 'благородный разбой'. [When those in power say the words 'honest elections' it sounds like 'honest *biznes*' and 'fair robbery'.]

Source: www.sovross.ru   Date: 28 October 1999

By contrast, in this letter to the editor the phrase *honest entrepreneur* (*честный предприниматель*) containing the Russian equivalent instead of the loanword *businessman* does not seem to be incongruous. The letter is addressed on behalf of such entrepreneurs, who call for political and structural support for their businesses. Assessed on its own, that is in the form of an extended concordance, this use signals acceptance of market economy values and therefore stands in contradiction to the negative evaluation of *business* in earlier texts. However, the author then proceeds to recycle a number of pro-Communist slogans and clichés about the evils of the market reforms, and only indirectly addresses the contradiction by pointing out that he was forced into entrepreneurship 'by circumstances'. Predictably, later in the text the loanword *business* is textually equated to crime through the use of parallelism, whereas

privatisation is labelled 'stealing' through a similar use of parallel structures in the second sentence:

(39) Наступила эпоха срастания власти и **бизнеса**, власти и **криминала**. Рэкет стал называться 'охранной структурой', а **воровство – приватизацией**. [The epoch has arrived where business and the authorities and business and crime have merged. A racket has come to be called a 'security organisation', and stealing is called 'privatisation'.]

Here the use of parallelism works to emphasise the similarities between structures, and simultaneously creates coherence and involvement with the audience (Tannen, 1989).

Source: www.duel.ru   Date: 10 October 2000

The historical allusions to the Great Patriotic War are continued in this text, where the loanword *businessman* acquires the textual synonym *fascist*. The negative evaluation is achieved through the use of a simile:

(40) А вот Березовскому можно, **бизнесмен**. Это теперь не **фашистское деяние**, как в случае с Гитлером; у Березовского – это **бизнес.** [Berezovsky, on the other hand, is allowed to do it because he is a businessman. Nowadays, this is not regarded as a fascist act as it was with Hitler; in the case of Berezovsky it's business.]

Business here is an unlawful and evil act promoting fear and disrupting the established social order.

Source: www.zavtra.ru   Date: 14 August 2001

The text is a collective letter signed by a variety of academics, writers, artists and editors, including the editor of *Zavtra* itself Prokhanov, and is entitled *Остановить 'РЕФОРМЫ СМЕРТИ'!* (Stop 'the reforms of death'!). The metaphor RUSSIA IS A LIVE ORGANISM occupies a prominent place. The authors are developing the metaphor scenario particularly favoured by the Communist leaders who speak of the Russian people being on the brink of survival. In this text, Russia is represented as afflicted by deadly illness caused by the reforms:

(41) И все понятней, страшней картина смертельной болезни, охватившей Россию. Лишенная животворных сил, обескровленная страна сохнет, уходит во тьму, погибает в каждой своей точке и на всем континенте. [The picture of the fatal illness that has seized Russia is becoming clearer

and more terrible. Deprived of life-giving forces, the bloodless country is withering, going away into the darkness and dying everywhere and throughout the whole continent.]

In this scenario, business is the activity of 'shadow economy people', 'magnates' and 'oligarchs' who do not care about their country (*вкладывают их в зарубежный **бизнес**, ничего общего не имеющий с потребностями чахнущей страны*/They invest them in foreign business that has nothing in common with the needs of a country that is withering away). As far as people in business not involved in illegal dealings are concerned, the phrase '*патриотические предприниматели*' (patriotic entrepreneurs) is used instead of the loanword *бизнесмены*.

> (42) На патриотических предпринимателей, живущих не одним барышом, но радеющих о силе и богатстве России. [He can rely on patriotic entrepreneurs who don't live just off their profits, but are concerned about Russia's strength and wealth.]

Source: www.sovross.ru   Date: 23 July 2002

As in (34), here the parallel structures are again used to contrast the present with an idealised Soviet past, and to provide such textual synonyms for business as 'swindles':

> (43) И гражданам, как правило, платили за труд, за реальную работу, а не за воздух или за разного рода аферы, именуемые слишком распространенным нынче словом **'бизнес'**. [And citizens, as a rule, were paid for their work, for real work, and not for various swindles, described by the nowadays excessively popular word 'business'.]

Source: www.sovross.ru   Date: 7 July 2003

In this text, the phrase 'the sharks of Russian business' is used to refer to people who have gained wealth through illegal activities. The animal metaphor, which is likely to be of Soviet vintage (cf. *хищные акулы империализма/the rapacious sharks of imperialism*) is used here to provide yet another pejorative synonym for 'large-scale businessmen' and 'oligarchs'.

> (44) Сегодня **акулы российского бизнеса** широко раскрывают свои пасти и угрожающе щелкают зубами – прорабатывают проект захвата контроля над Думой. [Today the sharks of Russian business keep opening their jaws wide and clicking their teeth threateningly: they are working on a project to gain control over the State Duma.]

Interestingly, the text contains another instance of *business* which is not marked by the negative undertones found in the preceding texts. This use resembles the semi-technical meaning of *business* as 'commercial trade' in English: *Россию 'тянет' в экспорте нефтедобыча, Израиль – вера в **бизнес*** [Russia is driven by oil in its export dealings, and Israel – by its faith in business].

Source: www.sovross.ru   Date: 19 August 2003

Connections to other texts: article in *Независимая газета* (30 July 2003).

Here businessmen who have connections in the government are described as 'the oligarchs'. However, as in the preceding text, the loan-word *business* is used in a positive context in the word combination 'small-scale business'. Doing middle and small-scale business is represented as an economic activity favourable for the country's economy:

(45) Ведь олигархи, по определению, есть **бизнесмены**, которые тес-нейшим образом связаны с государством, на самых высших его этажах. [они]… препятствуют развитию **малого и среднего бизнеса**, семейных и кооперативных предприятий … [The oligarchs, by definition, are busi-nessmen who are tightly connected to the state at the highest level. It is them who obstruct the development of small and middle busi-nesses, family and corporate enterprises …]

In order to investigate how the difference between a large- and small-scale business is constructed let us turn to the source text to which the current text is a reaction. According to its author, Boris Nemtsov, busi-ness is 'the most active part of the population, who work themselves and create work places for others; the country's wealth and progress is due to them' (*бизнес – это наиболее активная часть населения, которая трудится сама и создает рабочие места для других, благодаря которой соз-дается богатство страны, благодаря которой страна движется вперед*). This definition evokes a strong reaction, as most of this text is devoted to rejecting the above statement of the political opponent. As part of such disagreement paraphrases, the loanword *oligarchs* is used to relexicalise Nemtsov's use of *business*:

(46) Далее, очень интересно у г. Немцова утверждение о том, что **оли-гархи** создают-де рабочие места. А я вот отовсюду слышу и повсюду вижу иное: как только **приватизируют завод** или фабрику, так технологии сворачивают, цеха закрывают, рабочих увольняют. [After that, it's inter-esting to see Nemtsov's statement that the oligarchs create jobs. As

for me, I see quite different things everywhere and hear them from everywhere: as soon as factories and plants are privatised, the technologies are discontinued, the workshops are closed and the workers are fired.]

In this way, we can observe a differentiation in the deontic values attached to the meaning of *business*, which starts to emerge around this period and can be traced through two parallel tendencies. First, there is a tendency to use the phrase 'big business' with a negative connotation in the CPOP texts, synonymously with 'the oligarchs'. This meaning of business as a deeply corrupt and criminal activity is either used to describe the actions of the opponents directly, or through the recontextualisation of phrases from the opponents' texts. Second, the word *business* tends to be used without quotation marks and without negative undertones, particularly in collocations with such adjectives as 'small' and 'middle-sized'. This more recent usage indicates that *small-scale business* has shed its textual synonyms 'profiteering' and 'shuttle business' that accompanied it in the 1998 texts. Instead, it is now represented as an activity that should be developed and supported.

Source: www.sovross.ru   Date: 15 November 2003

The above-mentioned tendency to differentiate between small-scale businessmen as ordinary law-abiding people and large-scale businessmen linked to power and crime is particularly transparent in this text of the leader Zyuganov. Denying that the party is supported by 'the oligarchs' [*Никаких олигархов у нас в списке нет. И не будет*], Zyuganov speaks about businessmen among the party supporters:

> (47) КПРФ – это народный блок, который сегодня объединяет всех тех, кому за державу обидно, – заметил Г.Зюганов, отвечая на вопрос, почему партия пошла на сотрудничество с деловыми людьми, включив некоторых хозяйственников, **бизнесменов** и специалистов в свои предвыборные списки. [The KPRF is the people's party that today unites all those who feel insulted by what is being done to the state, – said G. Zyuganov, answering the question why the party cooperates with people in business by including economic planners, businessmen and specialists in their pre-election lists.]

Here 'businessmen' is incorporated into the chain of textual synonyms for the Russian term *деловые люди* (along with the positively connoted *хозяйственник*). It is no longer put in quotation marks, and not negative; on the contrary, businessmen are said to be one of those people who 'feel

hurt for what is done to the state'. The absence of quotation marks around the popular quote '*за державу обидно*' from the classic Soviet movie *The White Sun of the Desert* (1969) blends in with Zyuganov's patriotic statements about Russia as a Great Power. Here the word *держава* (power, a powerful state) used instead of *государство* (state) serves to emphasise cultural uniqueness and strength, as it is often used in contexts where an ideal of Russian statehood is discussed. It refers to a paternalistic state, characterised not merely by its military power but also by its cultural and literary legacy. The idea of *derzhavnost'* therefore connotes the crucial role of Russia in world affairs, the resurrection of Moscow as the Third Rome (the Russian empire as cultural and political successor to Rome) – ideas that occupy a central place in Zyuganov's rhetoric (Tsipko, 1996).

In the next paragraph the loanword *бизнес*, used without quotation marks, is said to be the activity of entrepreneurs or 'business people', rendered in Russian with the expression *деловые люди*. Represented this time as an occupation of the CPRF supporters, *business* is used with neutral-to-positive undertones:

(48) Сначала орали, что КПРФ против деловых людей. Теперь нас начинают упрекать: «Почему к вам пошли деловые люди?», – сказал Г.Зюганов. – Да потому, что они тоже недовольны нынешними порядками, которые ведут к деградации населения – и тем самым плохи и для их **бизнеса**. Деловые люди чувствуют в нас противовес партии власти … ['At first they shouted that the CPRF was against business people. Now they are starting to criticise us with: "Why have business people joined your party?"' Zyuganov said. 'Because they don't like the present day administration either; it leads to the degradation of the population and in this way it's bad for their business as well. Business people feel that we are a counter-balance to the ruling party …']

Source: www.sovross.ru   Date: 20 November 2003

In this text, *business* is used as a metonym for a group of people (Chapter 5). Drawing on the analysis of crime metaphors in the preceding texts, we can see that here the collective noun *бизнес* is a relexicalisation of such vehicles as *criminals, bandits* and *robbers* – in a scenario where the country is a victim of crime. The textual synonym *plunderers* is also readily provided:

(49) Как же так получается – **бизнес грабит государство**, грабит власть, а она не только терпит – поощряет мошенников? Ответ прост: в России бизнес и власть слились, они, как говорят ныне, в одном флаконе. [How come that at the moment business is plundering the state and robbing the

authorities, and they don't just tolerate it but encourage the plunderers? The answer is simple: in Russia business and the authorities have merged, they're both in the same bottle, as people say nowadays.]

Unlike *business* as a count noun used positively in preceding and parallel texts, here it is synonymous with 'oligarchs' and in this way is used to perpetuate the above differentiation between 'small-scale businessmen' as the CPRF supporters and 'large-scale businessmen' as criminals in cahoots with the politicians in power. Consequently, the metonym allows creation of a common unnamed enemy.

The history of paraphrases opens up the horizon of meaning of the loanword *business* for us. The negative deontic meaning and its Soviet-style definition as a dishonest activity are carried over to the texts written between 1998 and 2002. Here *business* denotes crime, and all businessmen are criminals. The editorials and letters to the editor develop this meaning in a mutually supportive fashion, linking business to stealing, drug-dealing, racketeering, prostitution and terrorism. However, starting from around 2002, a different pattern emerges. As we can see from the chronologically arranged list of paraphrases, there is a tendency to use *business* and *businessman* in a neutral to positive sense, although this use was not consistent, or rather not yet consistent. At this stage, only the expression *big businessmen* and *business* as a collective noun remain pejorative and are used synonymously with *oligarchs* and *prikhvatisers*.

The contrasting evaluations traceable through the use of this loanword reflect the CPRF's fluctuating position on private property and market relations. This contradictory stance is particularly apparent when one compares internal and external texts circulated among party members because, like many other parties, the CPRF has maintained front- and backstage personas (Wodak, 2009). March (2003: 180), for example, distinguishes between the official (orthodox Marxist, anti-liberal) ideology espoused in the writings of Zyuganov and party electoral platforms and internal party ideology displaying a more positive stance towards a mixed economy. The prominence of social democratic ideas after 2000 (coinciding with the start of Putin's rule) is related to the increasing influence of party moderates (2003: 194).

6.3   Conclusions

The primary objective pursued in this chapter has been to interpret meanings of the loanwords against the background of linguistic

constraints that members of the patriotic opposition discourse community were creating for their use. The history of paraphrases that emerged from this diachronic analysis elucidates how *business*, *privatisation* and *default* were being enlisted in the making of key political slogans and eventually became an essential part of the group's vocabulary.

Changes in deontic status

The diachronic investigation of paraphrases in the chronologically arranged corpus has enabled me to gain insights into changes in the deontic status of the loanwords. Whereas *business* and *businessman* gradually became used in the neutral to positive sense, *privatisation*, frequently relexicalised as an explicitly pejorative variant *prikhvatisation*, became a definite stigma word by the end of 2003. The loanword *default* also gradually developed into a stigma word.

In the first chronological subdivision of the CPOP, representing the years 1998 and 1999, the loanwords stayed at the level of mention rather than use, suggesting 'double-voicing' (Bakhtin, 1981). This is indicated by the rhetorical use of quotation marks and markers of distance such as *so-called* which were employed to emphasise the fact that the loanwords were being borrowed from the discourse of political enemies. In later texts, however, the loanwords lose the quotation marks and their status of 'echoic mention' as they sustain various pragmatic and semantic transformations. The metaphorical use of the term 'privatisation', for example, is picked up and extended by later texts that enter this loanword into collocations with a variety of modifiers. Such repetition and relexicalisation of metaphor vehicles eventually lead to the evolution of its meaning in the given discourse and the rise of a new word with a divergent spelling and pronunciation – *prikhvatisation* ('to seize through privatisation'). Thus, *privatisation* in quotation marks first becomes *prikhvatisation* and is used interchangeably with semi-fixed expressions *chubais' privatisation* and *thieving privatisation* as well as *rapacious privatisation*. Then, from around 2001 it is simply *privatisation* – a full-blown stigma word that no longer needs explanation or definition.

The loanwords *business* and *businessmen* also shed quotation marks and become used in semi-fixed expressions, such as *big business*. However, their connotations undergo a reversal: although they initially keep their negative evaluative accent inherited from Soviet times, in the period between 2002 and 2003 they start to be used in positive contexts, particularly when reference is made to small-scale entrepreneurs among CPRF supporters. Such a change in the deontic status is interesting to observe as it indicates the transcending of the boundary 'Us – Them',

which had been so carefully constructed in earlier texts. The change of connotation reflects the contradictory and fluctuating position on the preferred economic model in the texts of the CPRF and their allies, and is a reminder that politics and ideology-making are transient. Even within a discourse of the same community a word has developed a different deontic meaning, showing once again the crucial role of context in conditioning interpretation (Bakhtin, 1981).

Paraphrases as vehicles of evaluation

The negative evaluation is achieved explicitly through metadiscursive commentary and parallelism, as well as by more subtle means – through the use of irony and metaphor.

Metalinguistic commentaries are generally rare once a word has been in circulation as long as the loanwords had been by 1998. Yet in the patriotic opposition discourse we find that the struggle for political advantage triggers continuous and explicit definition and redefinition of these borrowings. The loanwords *privatisation* and *default* do not have an established pattern of use in Russian and represent particularly good material for various redefinitions and specifications aimed at creating negative associations. Such metadiscursive commentaries carry explicit evaluation and also spell out the semes composing the negative connotation (for example, *privatisation* is not only a 'swear word' but also 'fraud').

The CPC authors do not simply lexicalise the points of their concern, but overlexicalise by employing a range of lexical items often arranged in parallel grammatical structures to cover the same area. Relexicalisation and overlexicalisation are particularly transparent in texts of political leaders, which, in this corpus, are the texts written by the CPRF leader Gennady Zyuganov. Analysis of paraphrases employed by him shows that Zyuganov repeatedly uses a plethora of modifiers for *privatisation* such as 'thieving' or 'anti-people'. In this process of re- and overlexicalisation, contrasts are made between the 'good' Communist past with social welfare benefits, guaranteed jobs and other types of state protection, and the 'democratic' present characterised by the rise of crime, corruption and great economic instability. The loanwords are therefore used to flesh out the discourses of nostalgia, which reinterpret the current political situation in order to invoke an idealised and mythologised past. Such nostalgic pronouncements serve as unifying narratives that mask various tensions and contradictions inherent in the political programme of the CPRF.

Members of the oppositional discourse also draw on the rhetorical function of irony, capitalising on the dialogic nature of utterances to

convey evaluation. Irony dramatises the relationship with the Other who is positioned as the taker of the stance the writer wants to distance him/herself from (Hutcheon, 1995). Here the laudatives used by the liberal camp to describe their leaders ('the innovator', 'the father of privatisation') are put in quotation marks and followed by linguistic metaphors of crime and destruction. Some of these ironic paraphrases recruit the extremely positive connotations of sovietisms and use their pragmatic potential to highlight incongruity with the 'disasters' of Yeltsin's era. Thus, such positively charged phrases as *honour and valour, hero of the USSR, to name after someone,* and *the electrification of the whole country* are incorporated into ironic statements that combine the names of political adversaries with pejorative lexis. In contrast to the use of sovietisms as a way of ridiculing the totalitarian past in the 'liberal' editorials of the early post-perestroika period (Mokienko, 1998), here their role is to provide a negative portrayal of the political opposition in the spirit of an insider joke.

Among the evaluative uses of metaphor, the source domain of crime is one of the most productive. Crime metaphors are deployed in mutually supportive ways, for example when a text refers to privatisation as stealing and subsequent agreement paraphrases relexicalise the vehicle imagery as robbing, killing or strangling. The resulting metaphor scenarios enable the writers 'to build narrative frames for the conceptualization and assessment of sociopolitical issues and to "spin out" these narratives into emergent discourse traditions that are characteristic of their respective community' (Mussolf, 2006: 36). This delegitimisation strategy is further supported through employment of other domains, such as ECONOMY IS A BUILDING and NATION IS A HOUSE (Chilton, 1996), where political opponents are represented as breaking up or demolishing the country. Thus, as part of the 'destruction' scenario, privatisation and default are conceptualised as tools used by the Yeltsin team to bring down the economy, infrastructure or the whole country. The metaphor THE REFORMS ARE A CONSPIRACY presents yet another way to attack the opposing camp. The pattern occurs in the accusations that Chubais and other politicians are in an alleged 'ploy' with large business owners, and allows members of this discourse community to imbue their opponents with the qualities of duplicity and criminal behaviour. Used as part of such metaphorical structures, the loanwords gradually become associated with the 'destructive' policies of the ruling government.

The paraphrases also contain personifications that allow conceptualisation of the world in human terms (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). Personification can play an important role in creating an evaluative

stance, as according to Charteris-Black (2004) 'the choice of animate or inanimate metaphor systems reflects an epistemological perspective as to whether or not the events described are conceptualised as being under human control' (p. 141). The COUNTRY IS A PERSON metaphor, or more precisely, RUSSIA IS THE HUMAN BODY metaphor, 'can be subsumed under the general cognitive mode of embodiment' (Musolff, 2004: 60), where various parts of the body, such as the heart or, as in our examples, *the life blood* are used to organise knowledge into specific cognitive schemata. Personification is also 'closely connected with traditional forms of myth, as it exploits the common tendency to ascribe (mythological) personality or agentive power to animate or inanimate entities' (Kitis and Milapides, 1997: 567). In the metaphorical structures studied here, the Russian state and economy are portrayed as either heroes overcoming various adversities or the victims of ruthless and reckless criminals ('democrats'). A more specific type of personification is also used, namely, the metaphor RUSSIA IS A SICK PERSON, in which health and illness as aspects of the human body are used as source domains. As Charteris-Black (2004) points out, it is common to conceptualise 'social entities that are experiencing problems as if these problems were types of illness and the stages of these problems in terms of the stages of an illness' (p. 150).

The contextual interpretation of the loanwords has revealed a tendency to use them in metaphorical paraphrases in two additional domains: those of war and house. Vehicle development in the source domain of war serves to intensify polarisation, creating a representation of opponents as traitors to their country and enemies of the nation. Moreover, as Lakoff and Johnson (1980) explain, the war frame implies not only conflicting parties, but also the audience as viewers of the conflict. As a result, 'the audience predictably sides with one of the parties, mostly with the one that is believed to have been wronged, as sympathizing with one of the two adversaries is a widespread trait of our culture' (Kitis and Milapides, 1997: 567). Like crime metaphors, scenarios using the source domain of war are therefore used to appeal to the moral values of the audience. In the patriotic opposition discourse, such scenarios allowed the articulation of both nationalist and Communist slogans through the use of references to the Great War for the Motherland and reminiscences of Russia as a great military power.

Taken together, the combination of personification, crime and war metaphors leads to the articulation of a salvation myth, where Russia is positioned as a victim who has to be 'saved' or 'defended' against evil

forces. As Tsipko notes, this is an unprecedented narrative for the pro-Communist community to subscribe to:

> It must be noted that the KPRF is unique and distinct in that it places the problems of Russian statehood at the forefront, addressing the problem of salvation and the survival of Russian statehood in its historical sense. Never has a communist party defined itself as a party of national salvation, as a 'party of state patriotism'. (1996: 187)

These metaphorical constructs also serve to reinforce the message conveyed, and as such lend further evidence for the description of the loanwords' pragmatic and semantic roles. The identification of metaphor scenarios inferred through comparison of individual texts against other texts in the specialised corpus therefore helped me to refine my analysis of semantic associations. In this regard, Louw (1993) points out that '[…] the assistance of a metaphor can be enlisted both to prepare us for the advent of a semantic prosody and to maintain its intensity once it has appeared' (p. 172). In this study, this process of intensification was traced through the development of metaphoric scenarios. Mussolf (2006) proposed the narrative-based concept of scenario ('who does what to whom?') as a counterpart to the central mapping of conceptual metaphor theory. Tying central mappings to different action configurations with particular participants and roles, scenarios provide a greater 'argumentative situatedness' to conceptualisations (Kimmel, 2009). The use of *default* and *privatisation* as part of the scenario of a political plot, for example, not only highlights the negative evaluation but also identifies specific actors and their roles – that of the 'organisers' of the default. This provides further support for the existence of the semantic preference for a deliberate, premeditated action that emerged through the collocational analysis in the preceding chapter. The representation of privatisation and the 1998 default as the tools of murder, destruction or stealing allows the writers of later texts to pick up and develop the narrative, and in this way intensify the negative deontic meanings.

Intertextuality

The chronological study of paraphrases contributes to our understanding of the rhetorical function of intertextuality. Chapter 2 stressed that intertextuality as an attribute of political discourse is realised through reproduction of certain ideologemes, and associated values and cultural scripts. Changes and fluctuations in the political course induce changes in the corpus of precursor texts, as existing texts are substituted by new

ones, which will serve as a source of future citations. The intertextual connections traceable through the mark-up of texts in the CPOP indicate that members of this discourse community are aware of what was previously said on the topic and ensure that they include the key clichés and slogans to describe an issue at stake. At the same time, agendas constructed by the newspaper editorials are picked up and developed by letters to the editors. All of these textual reactions provide a window into how pragmatic phenomena such as evaluation are interpreted, and highlight the tension between creative and restrictive forces inherent in the negotiation of language norms.

On the one hand, we can observe creation of new precursor texts as patriotic opposition writers, and particularly political leaders among them, strive to interpret present-day realia in specific ways in order to develop an emotional anchorage for their collectivity. Their contributions display the rhetorical characteristics of heresy and discontinuity through the use of criminal slang, colloquialisms and low-register lexis. Whereas the (re-)lexicalisation of metaphor vehicles through colloquialisms and slang creates a particular language, 'the language that defends the soul of the simple Russian man' (Tsipko, 1996: 197), the reliance on oxymoronic elements and exaggerated playfulness suggests 'a sort of semantic masquerade' (Urban, 1994: 744) that brings us back to Bakhtin's analysis of carnival imagery and dialogic freedom. The use of the corpus search and concordance functions has helped to reveal how some of these texts become successful as precedents, as expressions used in them can be traced in subsequent written contributions to this discourse. This trend is most visible in Zyuganov's articles that appear to be the source of future citations.

On the other hand, however, we can also trace intertextual links to old canonic texts through the use of clichés and metaphors of Soviet times, as some authors are recontextualising meanings of the loanwords within the familiar ground of the formulaic Communist narrative (Yurchak, 2003). The increasing citation and ritualisation of the patriotic opposition discourse contribute to these doxic properties. The loanwords attract various modifiers (e.g. *Chubais, criminal* or *criminal-oligarchic privatisation*), which stay with them in identical or in a somewhat relexicalised form in later texts. Just as Stalin and Lenin were gradually transformed in *Pravda* editorials from practical leaders into ideological symbols (Pöppel, 2007) through repeated use of derivations from their names in eulogising statements (*ленинских принципов*/ Lenin's principles), the names of Chubais, Gaidar and Kirienko became ritualised in pejorative expressions in the CPOP texts. The writers also

resort to a more unexpected use of Soviet precedent texts to create ironic statements. In this way, although the obligatory quotations from Marx and Lenin are gone, the discourse continues to display rigid conventionalised phrases and instances of 'legacy semantics' (Ciscel, 2011).

The next chapter shows that such evocation of the Soviet past is not limited to the patriotic opposition discourse. The significant rhetorical effects offered by nostalgic narrative (Parry-Giles and Parry-Giles, 2000) make it a popular tool with other political leaders and the president in particular.

7
Metaphor Use in Political Speeches

This chapter continues a corpus-assisted analysis of political discourse by providing a critical exploration of metaphor use in Putin's political speeches. Using the concepts of 'discourse metaphor' and 'frame' I analyse speeches written and delivered between 2000 and 2007 in order to reveal the rhetorical strategies employed in them, and establish the ideological patterns of metaphor use. As the 'use and re-use of metaphors leads to the conventionalization of attitudinal judgements attached to them' (Cameron and Deignan, 2006: 676), analysis of metaphors can help disclose how given ideological assumptions are crafted and sustained in political discourse. In particular, I focus on the two types of metaphors that are frequently combined in Putin's speeches as well as in the political discourse in general: the path metaphor and the building metaphor. Following the research framework outlined by Chilton (1996) and Chilton and Ilyin (1993), the discussion will focus on how these metaphors constitute or contribute to Putin's strategies for advocating his policies, opposing the policies of others, and creating a particular political narrative.

Returning to the discussion of the evaluative role of metaphors in Chapter 1, here I explore the notions of legitimisation and delegitimisation strategies relating to Self and Other construction (Chilton, 2004; Wodak, 2004) as part of the analysis of metaphorical framing in political speeches. The analysis rests on the premise that analogies in public discourse use stereotypical representations of everyday situations to provide evaluative perspectives on contested topics (Musolff, 2006), as well as to legitimise political actions (Cap, 2006; Charteris-Black, 2005).

7.1   Path and building metaphors in Soviet and post-Soviet political discourse

The Russian president Vladimir Putin's two terms in office between 2000 and 2007 have attracted immense attention from political scientists (e.g. Fish, 2001; Sakwa, 2004; Shlapentokh, 2003; Hassner, 2008 among others) who occasionally used methods of discourse analysis (Anderson, 2001; Slade, 2006). In contrast, the language used by the president has only rarely been analysed. Among a few works, Ryazanova-Clarke studied discursive construction of the post-Soviet Russian nation in the televised presidential meeting with the public called 'Direct Line with the President' (2008b), while Parshina has explored Putin's use of specific lexical and grammar patterns of what she qualifies as 'the rhetorical competence' (*риторическая грамотность*) (2004, 2005).

Some political commentators have noted the president's love of analogical reasoning and his frequent use of path metaphors in particular (Slade, 2006). The metaphor of the path/road seems to be of special significance for Putin as shown by his often quoted statements on Russia's 'unique path' or a play on his surname as *path* in Russian is *путь*. It is likely that this etymological connection affected the Russian use of the word *путь* since 2000. For example, members of the '*Идущие вместе*' ('Marching together') youth movement of the 'United Russia' Party, now headed by Putin, wear T-shirts bearing Putin's face and the slogan '*Все путём*' ('Everything is on the way'/'Everything is tip-top'). The tenor association with Putin's image of a 'guy from a street gang' has something to do with the popularity of this expression which is derived from thieves' jargon[1] and widely used in the sense of 'coming along' or 'developing towards some goal' in contemporary Russian.[2]

Journey and building metaphors have a long history in cognitive linguistic research. Lakoff and Johnson (1980: 44) proposed that LOVE IS A JOURNEY is an underlying metaphor in such expressions as *we are at the crossroads, our marriage is on the rocks*, etc. Johnson (1987: 168) later reformulated the journey metaphor as PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITY IS TRAVELLING ALONG A PATH TOWARDS A DESTINATION. Mark Johnson (1987: 168) has noted that the PATH schema 'is one of the most common structures that emerges from our constant bodily functioning'; this schema is '(a) pervasive in experience, (b) well-understood because it is pervasive, (c) well-structured, [and] (d) simply structured'. The domain of BUILDING is another very important source domain used for the conceptualisation of abstract complex systems of any kind in terms of substances or things that we are familiar with from everyday experience (Kövecses, 2002).

The metaphors of journey/path/road and building/house/construction have always been popular in Western political discourse (e.g. see Musolff, 2004; Bolotova and Zinken, 2004) and occupied a special place in the Soviet totalitarian discourse. Lars Lih (2006) who reviews the story of Soviet society's triumphal journey towards Communism, based on the traditional Marxist–Leninist metaphor for conceptualising history, stresses that the path metaphor lay 'at the heart of the governing ideology of the Soviet Union' (2006: 26).[3] According to him, the inner history of Soviet ideology is the story of a metaphor – a history of the changing perceptions of the road to Communism. The self-definition of the Soviet Union as a traveller on the road to socialism coloured the country's political institutions, economy, foreign policy and culture:

> In 1925, Nicolai Bukharin's book Road to Socialism exuded the confidence of the first generation of Soviet leaders. Sixty years later, the catch phrase 'which path leads to the temple?' reflected the doubts and searching of the *perestroika* era. Right to the end the Soviet society assumed that there *was* a path with a temple at the end of it and that society had duty to travel down that path. (Lih, 2006: 25)

The road metaphor traditionally co-occurred with the building metaphor, where socialism was the building and the Communist Party was both the architect and the builder (Bourmeyster, 1998: 77). Thus the party claimed to have constructed socialism (Stalin) and to have built an advanced socialist society (Brezhnev). It is therefore of little surprise that for the discourse of perestroika which was intended as enhancement of the existing social formation, the metaphors of journey/road and construction/building occupied an especially prominent place. It has been observed that '*perestroika* as a discursive object was … framed by an elaborated metaphor' (Ryazanova-Clarke, 2008d: 91). Among first key references that Gorbachev used after he came to power were the metaphors *тупик* (the blind alley), related to Soviet development, and the verb *перестраивать/перестроить* (to restructure) which encapsulated economic changes. He also coined the formulation *Common European House* to promote the political vision of a collaborative way of living together for European nations (Chilton and Ilyin, 1993: 10) and went on to specify a different target for the construction metaphor: it was now a question of constructing a state based on law and the economy of the market (Bourmeyster, 1998: 77).[4]

After the perestroika era, however, a somewhat different use of the path metaphor emerged. Not long after Boris Yeltsin became president

he set out the think tank to have a unifying 'Russian idea' developed before the next election in 2000, as he realised that a common political language and an ideology to replace the Communist vision were urgently needed. This started yet another cycle of the nationwide search for a unique 'Russian path'.[5] As is shown below, Vladimir Putin's discursive products took up and developed the concept of the 'Russian idea' with the help of the creative use of path and building metaphors.

7.2   Metaphor identification

The approach pursued here is closer to a discourse-oriented analysis of small corpora pursued in applied metaphor research (e.g. Charteris-Black, 2004), rather than a more quantitative examination of large corpora representative of language as whole (e.g. Deignan, 1999). To overcome difficulties with metaphor identification, scholars using this approach engage in partial or total manual searching of the corpus texts first, and then turn to the software search function to locate specific instances in the corpus.

   In order to identify the 'candidate metaphors' (Charteris-Black, 2004: 12) from the conceptual domains of JOURNEY and BUILDING, a sample of texts was carefully studied and words carrying a metaphoric sense were categorised as metaphor keywords. These keywords were then used as search terms in the CPS (Chapter 5). Next, a qualitative analysis of contexts was carried out in order to decide whether each use of a keyword is metaphoric or literal (Pragglejaz Group, 2007; Cameron, 1999; Gibbs, 1999). At this stage, collocational profiles were used to examine the discourse further in order to support or refute hypotheses about the role of these metaphors in discursive strategies (Koteyko et al., 2008a, b; Koteyko, 2012). Concordances were generated for all instances of metaphorical expressions and analysed on both vertical and horizontal axes, taking into account extended and, where necessary, whole texts. Metaphor sources from the JOURNEY and BUILDING domains are listed in Table 7.1.

7.3   Metaphors in the corpus

A conceptual metaphor that is most obviously and frequently exploited in Putin's speeches is SUCCESSFUL ACTIVITY IS MOVEMENT FORWARDS or ACTIVITY IS PATH (Goatly, 1997). The JOURNEY domain incorporates closely connected but nevertheless ontologically different aspects of PATH and MOVEMENT/SPEED. It is based on the SOURCE–PATH–GOAL

Table 7.1 Metaphor keywords

Domain	Russian lexeme/ metaphor keyword	English translation
Journey	*путь, дорога, линия двигаться, движение, идти, шагать, шаг*	Path, road, line Move, movement, go, walk, step
Building	*строить, строение, здание, крепость, дом*	Build, building, dwelling, fortress, house
	рушить, ломать, перестройка, ломка	Destroy/demolish, break down, rebuild, restructuring, demolition

schema (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). In our corpus, the word *путь* (path) is most frequently used in its conventional meanings of [manner of action] and [goal-directedness of action] to discuss varied political activities. Most of our examples therefore relate to Russia's PROGRESS ALONG A PATH. This progress may be easy or difficult depending on the occurrence of OBSTACLES.

Let us now examine which parts of this metaphor field were activated in what way in Putin's speeches and what political actions they reflect, suggest or evaluate.

Path of development and renewal

The metaphors in Putin's speeches exploit the interference between the concept of *путь* [goal-directedness] with the more 'concrete', i.e. intersubjectively available, referent *put'* [path] to construct an analogy in which a particular political activity or task is presented as a path to be traversed. Although the topics of such metaphors are varied, the political task of achieving democratic and economic 'development' is characteristic of the earlier speeches (2000–1) and is repeatedly talked about as a path to be travelled (*путь демократического/экономического развития, путь развития демократии*).

(1) Сразу отмечу, что наш политический курс определен – определен четко, давно – и остается неизменным: мы идем по **пути демократиче-ского развития**, и приоритетом здесь остается обеспечение и реализация прав и свобод человека, создание условий для раскрытия потенциала каж-дого гражданина. (28 November 2001) [I will point out straight away that our political course is defined – and it was defined clearly and a long time ago – and is unchanged: we are travelling along the road of democratic development and the priority is still to guarantee and

implement human rights and freedoms, and to create the conditions for each citizen to reveal his potential.]

(2) Ключ к возрождению и **подъему** России находится сегодня в государственно-политической сфере. (1 January 2000) [The key to Russia's revival and rise is today located in the state and political sphere.]

Here Putin borrows from the glasnost era of the 1980s and its 'ideology of renewal' to claim common ground with his addressees, appearing to share the then popular goals and values. Interestingly, in Putin's later speeches 'development' means predominantly development of the economy, as there is no mention of the development of civil liberties or democratic institutions:

(3) Главный вопрос для нас с вами сегодня – как нам вместе видятся наиболее эффективные **пути развития** экономики России. (14 November 2003) [The main question facing us all today is how we jointly see the most efficient ways to develop Russia's economy.]

In (3) and in the examples in the rest of the section, Putin capitalises on the positive axiological elements that can be evoked in the path metaphor: following a path as MAKING PROGRESS; and following a path as MEETING A CHALLENGE (where 'path' emphasises the effort required to reach a political goal).

Obstacles/barriers might well occur on this path towards a better future. Again as with the phrase *путь развития* (the path of development), the barriers seem to be only on the path of economy and business (*на пути бизнеса*); no obstacles appear to be blocking the path of civil liberties, at least they are not included in the journey. This shows that Putin's discourse has a business orientation rather than a social one, and makes one speculate about the limiting effect of statements. As we are dealing with political speeches here, there is no doubt that this kind of discourse involves, above all, strategic selection of meanings.

(4) Однако в реальной предпринимательской практике они буквально на каждом шагу **натыкаются на огромное количество разных препятствий**. Препятствий, создаваемых и муниципальными, и региональными, и федеральными властями. (19 December 2001) [However, in real entrepreneurial activity they come up against a large number of obstacles of various types literally at every step, and these obstacles have been created by municipal, regional and federal authorities.]

As far as the Constitution and the new Russian democracy are concerned, the journey towards these notions is constructed as completed, as signalled by the past tense in (5):

> (5) Вы знаете, каким трудным **был путь к Конституции**. По сути, это **был путь к новому демократическому государству**. (12 December 2002) [You know how difficult the road to the Constitution was. In reality it was the road to a new democratic state.]

The collocational profile of the word *путь* seems to confirm the emphasis on the economic issues of Russia's journey. The corpus is too small to provide a significant repetition of the same collocate, but arranging collocates into semantic sets allows us to demonstrate the preference for the lexis of economy and business. For example, out of 122 instances of its use in the corpus, the noun *путь* co-occurs 63 times with the lexis from the semantic set of 'economy': *экономика* (economy), *экономический* (economic, mostly in 'economic development'), *бизнес* (business), *доход* (income), *деньги* (money); 12 times with lexical items denoting various obstacles or difficulties: *барьер* (barrier), *заслон* (obstruction), *препятствие* (obstacle), *проблемы* (problems), *трудный* (difficult); and only 5 times with *демократический* (democratic) and *государственность* (statehood). The emphasis on the development of economic liberties is indicative of the discourse of neo-liberalism, from which Putin borrows extensively (see also Sakwa, 2004: 18). This mixing of Western and Russian ideas is not accidental but an essential characteristic of Putin's discourse. As was pointed out by Slade (2006), this use of interdiscursive elements allows Putin to create a unifying discourse which 'sets up a reference point around which the political community can unite'.

In other cases Putin borrows from a historically more distant, Soviet discourse, as he alludes to the Communist past. In particular, he frequently uses the path metaphor – this time using the metaphor keyword *двигаться вперед* (move forward) – to talk about the country's progress towards 'a better future' and about achieving stability and prosperity. The focus on the better/brighter future resembles the use of the path metaphor in Communist speeches and makes it an effective allusion (Wodak, 2004), whereas the emphasis on stability and accompanying economic success contributes to the president's strategy of positive evaluation of his own leadership. The keywords used for the construction of success are lexical elements with the interdiscursive markers of the Soviet planned economy reports *положительный*, *успех*,

показатель (cf. Ryazanova-Clarke, 2008 b: 322) – creating the discourse of neo-Sovietism.

(6) За вклад в создание той атмосферы **стабильности**, к которой мы не раз обращались, к которой мы так долго стремились и которая нужна нашей стране, чтобы **двигаться вперед**. (11 December 2003) [For contributing to creating the atmosphere of stability to which we have turned time and again, to which we have striven for so long and which our country needs if it is to move forward.]

(7) Мы обязаны вместе **двигаться вперед**, быть на мировом рынке сильными, действительно конкурентоспособными и на этой базе стать **влиятельным современным государством**, а главное – должны совместными усилиями сделать жизнь людей экономически благополучной, их **достаток – весомым**, а условия работы – **стабильными и предсказуемыми**. (14 November 2003) [We must move forward together and we must be strong and genuinely competitive in the world market. Based on this we must become an influential modern state, and most importantly, through our combined efforts we must make people's lives economically prosperous, their well-being significant and their working conditions stable and predictable.]

(8) Уверен, что, опираясь на поддержку народа России, мы можем многое сделать на **пути движения** страны к **процветанию и укреплению стабильности**. (17 December 2007) [I am convinced that if we rely on the support of the Russian people we can do a lot to move the country towards prosperity and to strengthen stability.]

In (6–8), Putin employs the path metaphors to create an idea of travelling in time in order to relate the present to an idealised version of Russia's past history. Nostalgia has been found an effective rhetorical strategy in political speeches because of its emotional resonance (Charteris-Black, 2005). As Tannock (1995: 454) argues: the rhetorical use of nostalgia invokes an idealised, mythologised past to 'find/construct sources of identity, agency, or community that are felt to be lacking in the present'.

   The path metaphor is a common companion of the wilderness metaphor, as path signifies replicability and conveys a way through the wilderness and directionality of motion. However, the above examples show that in Putin's speeches, the path metaphors serve an additional purpose. Due to their long history of use in Soviet discourse, path metaphors can be powerful intertextual references to the more 'stable' past

and/or they can be combined with lexical elements signalling the posi-tive aspects of the historical past, such as the time before the 'destruc-tive' Yeltsin decade. Thus, the associations of the road/movement forward are linked to the Communist past which in turn is associated with economic stability and regular wages. This provides a powerful emotional link between the 'stable' Soviet past and the present.

'Destructive' path of the previous political regime

The use of the path metaphor also allows the president to evaluate events negatively. The adjectives *трудный, опасный, разрушительный* are used with the noun 'path' to frame negatively the decade of the 1990s, i.e. the period immediately preceding Putin's term in power. Here the path metaphor is combined with the building metaphor to underline 'the destruction' of the state.

> (9) Мы **шли к этому дню сложным, извилистым и тяжелым** путем.
> Я позволю себе вспомнить начало 90-х годов, когда подавляющее боль-шинство граждан России связывали свои надежды на лучшую жизнь с завоеванной свободой и демократией. И это действительно необходимое условие для развития любой страны и любого народа. Вместе с тем мы с вами хорошо знаем и помним, что страна столкнулась со сложными про-блемами в сфере экономики и, по сути, **развалом** социальной системы – во всяком случае, с **развалом** старой социальной системы, на смену которой ничего **не пришло**. Все это не могло укреплять, а, наоборот, **разрушало** государственные институты. (12 December 2005) [We have arrived at today via a complicated, winding and difficult road. May I remind you of the beginning of the 1990s, when the overwhelming majority of Russia's citizens linked their hopes for a better life to the freedom and democracy that they had won. And this is indeed an essential con-dition if any country and any people is to develop. But we all know and remember very clearly that the country encountered difficult problems in the field of the economy and, essentially, with the collapse of the social system, or at least the collapse of the old social system, which was not replaced by anything. None of this could strengthen the state institutions, but on the contrary, it destroyed them.]

With the help of this creative combination of path and building meta-phors, the 1990s, the period of Boris Yeltsin's presidency, is consistently repositioned into the negative knowledge schema with the utilisation of the strategy of demontage. In this way, memories of Russia's independ-ence, liberation from Communist ideology and democratic freedoms

previously associated with the 1990s are suppressed and backgrounded, while the period is described within the new knowledge frame as a time of instability, moral corruption, populism and inefficiency of the government (Ryazanova-Clarke, 2008a).

Russia's path

Right from the start of his presidency in 2000, Putin used the path metaphor to declare his definition of the Russian nation in his 'Millennium Manifesto' (appeared on the president's website on 1 January 2000). The Manifesto capitalised on the positive connotations accompanying the new millennium as a new historical vista and proclaimed the end goal to be the economic well-being of the Russian people as 'an ideological, spiritual and moral problem'. There is a pronounced emphasis on the national-oriented notions of 'our own', 'Russia's path' as Putin speaks about the path of development or renewal and expansion:

(10) Каждая страна, в том числе и Россия, обязана искать **свой путь обновления**. Мы пока не очень преуспели в этом. **Свою дорогу**, свою модель преобразований мы начали нащупывать только в последние год-два. (1 January 2000) [Each country, including Russia, must look for its own road to renewal. So far we have not been very successful in this. It is only in the last year or two that we have begun to feel our way towards our own route and our own model for transformation.]

(11) Вопрос самоопределения. Я бы сказал даже точнее: **духовного самоопределения**. Этот **путь** – не всегда прост. Ведь понятие 'русский мир' испокон века выходило далеко за географические границы России и даже далеко за границы русского этноса. (11 October 2001) [The question of self-determination. I would be even more specific: spiritual self-determination. This road is never straightforward. After all, from time immemorial the concept of the 'Russian world' has reached far beyond Russia's geographical boundaries, and even far beyond the boundaries of the Russian ethnos.]

Two years later when addressing diplomatic representatives from Canada, Putin while using the same metaphor to point to the 'common' challenges also emphasised the unique experience and 'achievements' of the Russian people striving to 'strengthen/fortify statehood'.

(12) Россия и Канада, как и любые федеративные государства мира, обречены **постоянно двигаться вперед**, все время осваивать **трудный**

путь. Но у России здесь уже есть и свои традиции, и свои ошибки, и свои достижения. […] налицо стремление **укрепить государственность**, создать эффективную модель взаимоотношений регионов и федерального центра, обеспечить равноправие граждан наших стран на всей территории страны. (15 February 2002) [Like any federative state in the world, Russia and Canada are fated to move constantly forward and keep on opening up a difficult road. But in this respect Russia already has its traditions, its mistakes and its achievements. ... we can see a striving to strengthen statehood, to create an efficient model for relations between the regions and the federal centre, and to guarantee equal rights for the citizens of our countries throughout the entire land.]

Thus Putin's use of the path metaphor increasingly evokes the concept of the 'Russian idea' merging into a blended version of 'Russia's path', understood as the unambiguously 'correct' path. While in earlier speeches the path has to be found, the material of the second presidential term suggests that it has already been 'chosen' by the Russian people under Putin's leadership:

(13) Но я уверен: **путь**, **выбранный народом России**, – **правильный**, и он **приведёт нас к успеху**. У нас всё для этого есть: наша великая история, колоссальные ресурсы, мужество, трудолюбие и интеллектуальный потенциал нашего **великого народа**. (31 December 2007)

[But I am convinced that the path chosen by Russia's people is the right one, and will lead us to success. We have everything for this: our great history, our immense resources, our bravery and our industriousness, and the intellectual potential of our great people.]

Closer to the end of his second term in office, a new path-oriented term was coined in the speech outlining Putin's vision for the 20 years of future Russian development, which became known as 'Putin's plan'. The speech was widely covered by the media and became an essential element of the election campaign waged by the 'United Russia' Party. Discourse of the 'United Russia' Party that associates itself with Putin's plan suggests that this concept is understood within the frames of both, path (which has directions and stages) and building. The following expressions from speeches of the party elite demonstrate this: *стратегические направления* (strategical **directions**); *этапы реализации* (stages of realisation); *время* ***строить***! (time to build!); *по плану Путина* (according to Putin's plan); *партия … должна быть и заказчиком, и прорабом … на этой* ***стройке***

(the party should be both client and superintendent in this building site).[6] The five 'steps' of the plan reveal the underlying metaphorical vision of the path and were used to highlight Putin's ideas of statehood and building 'the vertical of power', which is another Putin ideologeme (Ryazanova-Clarke, 2008b) associated with the upright direction of the path as well as vertical construction in the building industry.

Analysis in the next section demonstrates how use of the building metaphor contributes to this reassertion of the state's symbolic power in terms of defining the nation and the mobilisation of consent for Putin's vision for Russia.

Construction of the 'strong state'

Building metaphors are often used with positive undertones (Mussolf, 2004) as building implies coordinated human effort and, just as with the path metaphor, it means development in a certain direction, for example in a building economy, leading it on a path. More importantly, it also means a collective effort, which makes building metaphors an effective device for emphasising the consolidation of society in pursuit of a common goal.

The proliferation of building metaphors in Putin's texts serves to demonstrate the preoccupation of his government with the idea of the 'restoration' of order after the turbulent Yeltsin decade. The frequent use of the noun *государство* (state) and *государственность* (statehood) as targets shows that order was being restored above all at the state level – the hierarchical machinery of the state, the so-called hierarchy of governance. The ideas of 'strong' and 'great' state are again evoked here, as Putin emphasises the need either to build (*построить*) or, most frequently, 'fortify' the state apparatus (*укрепить/укреплять* which has the same root as *крепость* (fortress)). The idea of fortification suggests counteracting danger, represented by ruining of the structure (*дизинтеграция*).

> (14) За десять лет мы **прошли очень сложный путь**, накопили уникальную практику государственного и политического **строительства**. Российский народ **сформировал** демократическую государственную власть. Механизм свободных выборов устойчиво работает на всех уровнях. Существенно **укрепились** основы федерализма. (7 December 2001) [Over the last ten years we have travelled along a very difficult road and have accumulated a unique experience of building a state and a political system. The Russian people have established a democratic state power. The

mechanism for free elections is working reliably at every level. The foundations of federalism have been considerably strengthened.]

Вертикаль власти is also used in the context of building and fortification and forms a crucial element of the 'strong' or 'effective' state. Representing a line or trajectory, the vertical blends the conceptual elements of PATH/ROAD and BUILDING. Furthermore, it contains an underlying positive evaluation consistent with the metaphorical extension GOOD IS UP (Goatly, 1997: 16). In this way, the top element of this 'power vertical' – the ultimate consolidation of political powers – is represented as imminent success (a few steps away):

(15) Мы должны прислушаться к любому мнению, но при этом мы не должны забывать о том, что **последние шаги по укреплению вертикали власти** – это ответ на те реалии жизни, которые по сути своей являются не эфемерной, повторяю, не виртуальной, а **реальной дезинтеграцией** государства. Здесь важно не перегнуть палку, здесь важно **выстроить точно и ясно** взаимоотношения между федеральным центром и регионами. (22 November 2000) [We must listen to any opinion, but at the same time we must not forget that the latest steps in reinforcing the vertical nature of power are an answer to those realities of life which by their nature are not an ephemeral, I repeat, not a virtual, but a real disintegration of the state. It's important not to go too far, it's important that we draw up a precise and clear relationship between the federal centre and the regions.]

The ideal construction of the vertical of power is seen as 'precise and clear', thus the positively connoted engineering metaphorical image is transferred onto the relationship between the centre and the regions in the situation of the removal of the elected post of governor and the centralisation of authority. The use of the path and building metaphors in (14) and (15) is also revealing of how Putin is manipulating and transforming the concept of statehood and 'strong power' by employing the image of the structural 'solidity' (*крепкий*). In (16), this 'strong power' is positioned as a force that will move the country on its path of change and development.

(16) **Крепкое** государство для россиянина не аномалия, не нечто такое, с чем следует бороться, а, напротив, источник и гарант порядка, инициатор и главная **движущая сила любых перемен**. (1 January 2000) [For a Russian, a strong state is not an anomaly; it is not something

with which you have to fight. On the contrary, it is the source and guarantor of order, and the initiator and main moving force for any changes.]

Kryshtanovskaya and White (2003: 292) speak about a tendency towards the restoration of the old order, a 'Sovietization of the regime'. The invocation of the elements of the great state (*держава*) of the Soviet Union through building and path metaphors is certainly pointing towards this tendency for neo-Sovietism.[7] As Slade (2006) remarks, the renaissance of legitimacy for the state in Russia suggests that 'Putin has renewed the symbolic capital of the state by promoting it as a structure that acts as an underlying principle for group construction'.

   The president has also been noted to hold many neo-Soviet views concerning military strategic defence (Fish, 2001). In this respect, the house metaphor introduced into European political discourse by Gorbachev is of paramount importance. Similar to Gorbachev, Putin uses the metaphor in order to highlight the need for a strong security policy by alluding to stereotypical knowledge related to the structure and stability of a house (Chilton and Ilyin, 1993). When comparing the military budget of the United States with that of Russia, Putin uses the house metaphor to positively evaluate the large scale of military spending as it is portrayed as contributing to the stability and strength *(крепкий, крепость)* of the country conceptualised as a house. The need for the construction of 'Russia's own' secure house is underlined:

(17) Их военный бюджет в – абсолютных величинах – почти в 25 раз больше, чем у России. Вот это и называется в оборонной сфере **«Их дом – их крепость».** И молодцы. Молодцы! Но это значит, что и мы с **вами должны строить свой дом, свой собственный дом – крепким, надеж-ным,** потому что мы же видим, что в мире происходит. (10 May 2006) [In absolute terms their military budget is almost 25 times the size of Russia's. In the field of defence this is called 'their home is their castle'. Well done, men! But this means that you and me, we should build our house, our own house, so that it is strong and reliable, because we can see what is going on in the world.]

Delegitimisation with the help of *перестройка* and *ломка*

Just as *barriers* and *obstacles* were employed as part of the path metaphor to negatively evaluate the previous political regime, Putin's metaphorical use

of the verb *ломать* and the noun *ломка,* which in his speech is synonymous with perestroika, serves as a delegitimisation strategy to portray the events following the breakdown of the Soviet Union in a negative light:

(18) Под какими бы лозунгами – коммунистическими, национально-патриотическими или радикально-либеральными – ни развернулась бы **очередная крутая ломка** всего и вся, государство и народ ее не выдержат. (1 January 2000) [No matter under what slogans – Communist, national-patriotic or radical-liberal – the latest breakdown in all and everything has occurred, the state and people will not tolerate it.]

Помните, как бодро и громко мы пели в свое время, что мы все **разломаем** «до основанья, а затем мы свой, мы новый мир построим – кто был ничем, тот станет всем»? Чем все это закончилось – хорошо известно. (4 December 2000) [Do you remember how in our time we boldly and loudly sang that we would tear everything down 'to the foundations, and then we will build our own world, a new world, and he who was nothing will become everything'? We know well how all that ended.]

Instead of the once popular slogans calling for restructuring which, characteristically, he now associates with both ruining and stealing, Putin's speeches contain appeals for continuity of the current state of affairs – the status quo under his government. Here even the Soviet past, as far as its references to restructuring are concerned, is being dismissed as harmful.

(19) Но это еще не повод для предложений об ее **'очередной коренной и всесторонней' ломке, перестройке.** Думаю, полезнее – и с практической, и с государственной точек зрения – довести начатое до конца, добиться эффективной работы **того, что уже сложилось** и действует. По-моему, это более **конструктивный путь**, **чем ломка** всей системы в целом. (27 November 2000) [But that still is not a justification for recommendations for its 'next radical and all-round' demolition and reconstruction. I think that it is more useful, from both the practical and the state points of view, to finish off what you have started and to ensure that what has already been established and is working operates efficiently. In my view this is a more constructive route than the complete demolition of the whole system.]

(20) Сегодня все видят, что Россия накопила огромные ресурсы. Кому-то хочется вновь все отнять, поделить, а затем **разрушить до основания**, как это делали уже не однажды, а кому-то – опять все **растащить и**

разворовать. (21 November 2007) [Nowadays everybody can see that Russia has built up vast resources. Some people want to take everything away again, share it out, and then demolish it down to the foundations, as has already been done more than once, and some want to tear everything apart and steal it again.]

The interactive chains of path and building metaphors create an evaluative framework with the help of the contrast that is set up between the positive and negative aspects of journeying and building. On the one hand, the use of the metaphors is associated with the positive feelings aroused by economic prosperity images: *развитие, стабильность, благосостояние, успех*. Drawing on common narratives of the Soviet and post-Soviet periods, this is a discourse of unity and stability, not dissimilar to the Soviet 'success discourse', creating 'an all-national spiritual reference point that will help to consolidate society, thereby strengthening the state' (Slade, 2006). On the other hand, negative feelings are evoked by chaos and economic depression images in the words *развал, разруха, ломка* or *разрушать*. This in turn allows the association of the Yeltsin regime with the wrong/mistakenly taken path, and Putin's government with the victorious/successful path.

7.4   Explanation of metaphor use and its rhetorical power

According to Charteris-Black, critical metaphor analysis enables us to identify '*which* metaphors are chosen and to explain *why* these metaphors are chosen by illustrating *how* they create political myths' (2005: 28, original emphasis). In this study, it can be argued that the use of path and especially building metaphors allows the president to represent himself as a dynamic agent who is 'mythically in control of the forces of creation and destruction' (Charteris-Black, 2005: 25). Against the perceived 'time of troubles' of Yeltsin, Putin emerges as a strong ruler moving Russia towards economic stability and prosperity (path metaphors may activate deeper-rooted mythical elements of heroes embarking on the journey to defeat evil forces). This, in turn, is represented as a development towards a restoration of the Great Russian State. The path metaphors may implicitly add to this image of a strong ruler with accompanying references to control, as according to the path/course/route metaphor schema there is only one best direction to the goal (Goatly, 1997).

The study of metaphors has also pointed to the high level of intertextuality and interdiscursivity in Putin's texts, as he frequently

appropriates elements from competing texts and ideologies. The discourse metaphor of the 'unique Russian path' plays a crucial role in this rhetorical exercise as it allows drawing on elements across several hundred years of Russian history. These references to the Russian idea create a powerful emotive discourse which adds to Putin's popularity as a 'strong' leader. As Tim McDaniel (1996: 30) puts it, 'no matter how complex and plural the cultural and political undercurrents of Tsarist Russia and the Soviet Union, until Gorbachev the victory was always to those who advocated a special Russian path'.

Journey metaphors can be used to evoke a sense of change, breaking up with the past, especially when the past is characterised as destructive. In this case, appeals are made to embark on a new journey. However, when the past is described in positive terms the journey metaphor can be an effective rhetorical device to stress continuity or gradual transition. The analysis presented in this chapter has shown that Putin uses both aspects of the journey metaphor. In his early speeches, he calls for the people to embark on a new journey under his leadership, a journey that represents a break from the recent past characterised by democratic reforms that are said to have brought chaos and economic instability. His later speeches, however, emphasise the journey itself and contain positive references to the Communist past and the search for the Russian idea. The 'right', i.e. 'Russia's, path' therefore appears to have started either with the period of Communism or even with the beginning of the Romanov dynasty. In this way, instead of allowing the Soviet period to be a 'blind alley', Putin seeks to place it within a historical and political continuum, by bringing back the memories of the Great State and focusing on its positive aspects such as economic 'stability' and 'order'.

The explanation of metaphor use in Putin's speeches will not be complete without consideration of the political, international and economic context of the period. Returning to Bourdieu's work, the power of discourse must be explored in relation to 'the mechanisms that produce both words and people who emit and receive them' (1996: 41). We therefore need to understand not only how the speaker is situated in the field of symbolic power but also their position in the political or economic field. In this regard, we have to take into account two factors that contributed to Putin's popularity as the symbol of strength, stability and youth, which later found reflection in his use of metaphors. At the early stage in 1999, this representation owed some of its success to Putin's role in the conflict in the North Caucasus when as the new prime minister he sent troops back into Chechnya, famously promising 'to

kick the shit' out of the rebels (Shevtsova, 2007a: 36). Adopting a non-compromising position with the rebels and achieving military success strengthened his image of a decisive leader and contributed to victory in the presidential election. Later on, the high price of oil and the commodity price boom coinciding with the period of his presidencies also played their part. Soaring oil prices helped secure stability and improve living standards – the factors likely to be capitalised upon in the construction of a political image after a decade of political, economic and societal turmoil. They certainly played a part in the representation of Putin as the 'guarantor of order' (Shevtsova, 2007a: 44).

In conclusion, the above analysis has shown how path and building metaphors were used as part of legitimisation and delegitimisation strategies in order to promote a two-part narrative, according to which, under Boris Yeltsin the state and the economy were in ruins leading to the drastic deterioration of living conditions, whereas since 2000, under Putin, order and economic stability have returned, and Russians are on the way to a prosperous future. It is this story that according to some critical voices (Fish, 2001; Hassner, 2008; McFaul and Stoner-Weiss, 2007) may serve to advance the view that the democratic gains in the post-Soviet period are necessary sacrifices to be made on the path of stability and growth. Although the metaphorical expressions used by Putin are conventional and have a strong experiential grounding, they were chosen pragmatically and are well in line with the president's discursive strategies. These discourse metaphors have helped to frame the rise of what has been labelled the 'neo-authoritarian Putin militocracy' (Kryshtanovskaya and White, 2003: 297), recreating a 'facade' democracy of the kind that existed in the Soviet period.

8
Concluding Thoughts

This book has examined the productive relationship between language and political realities in post-Soviet Russia shortly before and during Vladimir Putin's first two terms in office. Designed as a corpus-assisted exploration of both mainstream and opposition discourses, it has focused on the twofold role of language in political actions: that of establishing or challenging dominant perceptions through collective symbols and metaphors, and as a means of defining group identity by establishing common narratives (Townson, 1992). The analyses presented here are underpinned by the view of corpus linguistics as a discipline that studies meaning as use, and show that it offers a rich potential for a systematic and critical interrogation of discursive practices. Here I reflect on the key theoretical and methodological points and provide appraisal of the main findings.

8.1 Using specialised corpora in the study of political discourse

Two aspects of theoretical and methodological development in relation to corpus-assisted discourse analysis merit special attention. In the first place, this study has identified various benefits of using well-organised 'tailor-made' corpora for an in-depth analysis of discursive strategies in Russian media and political texts. Second, it has demonstrated how the concept of intertextuality, going back to Bakhtin and French post-structuralists, can be recruited in a detailed diachronic analysis of meaning. I have assumed a broadly discourse historical perspective, but found it useful to extend the theory by introducing a notion of agreement and disagreement paraphrases to reflect the dialogical interplay inherent in every statement. The underlying argument is that corpus

linguistic techniques can be used for analysing intertextual links that a lexical item acquires during its use in discourse, as well as for revealing aspects of lexico-grammatical usage not clearly visible to the eye.

According to Partington (2003: 256) we are now in the third age of corpus linguistics – the Age of Specialisation, after the Age of Pioneers in the 1970s and the Age of Expansion in 1980s, which heralded rapid creation of large heterogeneric corpora. This is the time when large corpora continue to grow, but in parallel the need to compile small-scale collections of text for examining specific issues and problems is becoming increasingly evident. In contributing to this burgeoning field, this book has focused on the advantages of using special purpose corpora in discourse studies, which includes critical metaphor analysis. The proposed approach combines contextual, textual and intertextual analyses, treating meaning as both historically and culturally specific. It eschews the clear division into semantics and pragmatics, and questions the traditional distinction between lexical (linguistic) and encyclopaedic (extra-linguistic) knowledge.

The specialised corpora have enabled me to investigate the use of individual words and metaphors in Russian political discourse on both synchronic and diachronic planes. The synchronic approach that views discourse as 'constellations of repeated meanings' (Stubbs, 2001: 147) provided the first insights as to how the selected lexical items are employed to evaluate events, people and phenomena by members of competing political groups in post-Soviet Russia. Here the predominant assumption has been that words are recycled in typical patterns, which produce ways of talking that are conventional and characteristic of a given discourse community. In Chapter 5, for example, the quantitative analysis has shown how the recurrent wordings occurring in the environment of the loanwords are extending their meanings from semi-technical terms to ideologically coloured lexical items as objects of political debate. The repeated lexical patterns brought about specific associations, providing evidence that the identified connotations were not idiosyncratic but widely shared across the patriotic opposition discourse community.

In addition to employing specialised corpora to obtain access to *langue* in the Saussurean sense (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001; Philip, 2011), I have also argued that they can be used to investigate how meanings are carried over from previous contexts. Here the dialogic nature of discourse espoused in the works of Bakhtin was used to support a diachronic approach, absent from many corpus-based studies. To advocate the necessity of including the diachronic perspective in any attempt at

understanding the impact of temporal context, Chapter 2 discussed a view of discourse as a concrete socio-historical formation characterised by particular ways of using language, as well as by particular relationships between texts. In this context, meaning is seen as located in textual contributions and reactions supplied by members of a discourse community. This approach treats a corpus as a collection of interrelated texts and covers both lexical meanings and their interpretations as part of a dialogue. Tracing the use of a particular lexical item across written texts of a discourse community and over time presents the analyst with an in-depth picture of meaning produced in specific socio-historical circumstances.

The investigations of intertextual features in literary and cultural studies tend to be focused on the content plane, i.e. contextual interpretations of word meanings. There are, however, some important linguistic features of coherence and cohesion which can be automatically retrieved with the help of corpus linguistic software. Considering lexical semantics and text representation issues together avoids a mismatch between the two, leading to a more inclusive view of meaning. For this reason, the analyses undertaken in Chapters 5 and 6 are to be seen as mutually contributing rather than exclusive. I first carried out the collocational analysis to look at how selected loanwords behave in the media texts: what word groups they enter, how their meanings are modified by other words and what patterns of variation (lexical, semantic or thematic) can be established. Analysis in Chapter 6 then used the results of this synchronic analysis as the basis for further investigation of thematic and lexical variation in the unfolding of argumentative writing over time. This kind of analysis of both linguistic and content features contributes to the validity of my conclusions concerning the dynamics of lexical meaning.

The mark-up of texts with background information and documentation of the steps taken in the compilation of special purpose corpora has important implications for the contentious view of context in corpus linguistics. As Mautner (2007: 65) points out, 'what large-scale data are not well suited for … is making direct, text-by-text links between the linguistic evidence and the contextual framework it is embedded in'. By contrast, specialised corpora allow retention of much of the contextual information through the inclusion of specific parameters such as time period, area and/or text type into the mark-up, which means that the analysis and interpretation can be carried out with constant reference to the sociocultural context. If such corpora are compiled to constitute an intertextual entity as has been done in this book, then we also have

an opportunity to study the relationships between texts that are inevitably obscured in quantitative analyses. Specialised corpora with such an intertextual dimension may therefore be seen as a 'halfway house' between a qualitative, software-assisted analysis of a relatively large collection of texts and a detailed study carried out in the literary tradition where in-depth research on text production and reception is performed.

Knowledge of the social background and intended audience contributes to the understanding of individual texts in the corpus, and may alert the analyst to any changes of meaning that occur over time. As a rule, it is difficult to establish what triggers change in evaluation, as connotations are a fleeting phenomenon continuously negotiated by members of a discourse community. The approach adopted in this book has enabled description of conceptual and semantic changes by investigating the links that obtain between a particular use of a word and other uses that precede or follow it. This, in turn, has allowed me to arrive at description and explanation, step by step, on the basis of the evidence provided by the textual contributions of discourse community members.

Corpus linguists striving for automated language analysis find it difficult to tackle pragmatic phenomena, and here again a study of intertextual features can provide necessary additional clues to the analysis of meaning. In combining the notion of collocation with the diachronic analysis of a special purpose corpus, the analyst has access to new understandings of irony and metaphor and their evaluative function. Thus, in Chapter 5 evaluation was first approached on the lexico-grammatical level and related to the phenomenon of semantic prosody. Here the comparative study of two discourses provided evidence about the norm against which individual instances of irony could be evaluated. However, it was argued that during this statistical processing of texts in the corpus, particular attention should be paid to the examination of concordances, as the display of different contexts on the vertical axis allows for additional clues to be found about the rhetorical uses of a word. Positioning the phenomena of semantic prosody squarely within the domain of interpretation rather than software-driven identification, the analysis has shown that the collocational environment of the loan-word is only one piece of the puzzle, and computer-assisted analysis of lexis only uncovers the tip of the iceberg. As Hutcheon (1995) has shown, the attribution of irony depends on complex cultural framing, which means that identification of the 'markers of irony' is always conditional on recognition and activation by a discourse community in a particular shared context. Chapter 6 therefore examined how

principles of corpora compilation and management can assist in the interpretation and refinement of pragmatic values assigned to political catchwords. Here my reading of the ironic intent into the patriotic opposition texts was supported by knowledge of the community behind each text as well as by analysis of intertextual links.

Similarly, the construction of specialised, chronologically ordered corpora can enable a mixed quantitative and qualitative analysis of metaphor. Recent developments in metaphor studies have led to interest in how metaphors develop within and across text rather than solely within grammatical, semantic and syntactic boundaries at the sentence level. Studies of metaphor use in conversations examined metaphor development between speech turns as participants are 'co-creatively recycling, extending, fine tuning and retuning each other's metaphors' (Carter, 2004: 121), whereas analyses of political discourse paid attention to how metaphor patterns across texts produced by a discourse community can shape evaluative preferences (Mussolf, 2006). In this book, metaphors have been found to underpin and sustain an implicit but consistent argument seeping through different paraphrases of political catchwords. Consequently, it was argued that although the presence of metaphors is evidenced at the level of lexical choice in concordances, we need access both to a whole individual text as well as to the overall network of written contributions to reconstruct particular metaphor scenarios. By studying how members of a discourse community redeploy metaphors used in preceding texts, analysis of special purpose corpora has shown that writers not only 'negotiate' understanding (Cameron, 2010) but also co-create ideological norms, which in turn contributes to the creation and maintenance of discursive traditions.

A word on limitations. Despite the great potential of corpus-assisted discourse analysis, the complexities underlying the merging of linguistic and discourse analytic categories are also significant. The framework for interpreting resonances of intertextuality is ambitious in its integration of theory-driven and data-driven approaches, and theoretical contradictions have not been explored. Rather, the choice of discourse analytical and corpus linguistic frameworks was driven by common interest in real and contextualised language use and an assumption that lexico-grammatical patterning can reflect the communicative function. Finally, it should be stressed that the merging of corpus linguistic and discursive approaches highlights the fact that replicability claims associated with corpus-assisted analysis only apply to analytical categories and procedures, and not the interpretation of software-generated patterns.

8.2 Post-Soviet discourses of legitimation and delegitimation

The corpus-assisted analysis enabled me to explore the linguistic side of different discourses of legitimation and delegitimation in post-Soviet politics. Seeing language as populated with intentions of others (Bakhtin, 1981: 294), I have examined how the meanings of political catchwords and metaphors have been shaping up across multiple texts, as context-laden and historically generated concepts. In this context, particular attention was paid to how the enthusiastic use of puns, metaphor, allusion and various type of language game allows the adoption and expression of a critical stance towards reality (Widdowson, 2008) in post-Soviet media and political texts. The focus on the plurality of meanings also helped to uncover the lingering linguistic traces of the totalitarian past that survived and transcended the chaos and fluidity of the early post-Communism years.

The analysis in Chapter 5 has shown how Russia's post-Soviet journey is reflected in the conflicting connotations of business and economy-related loanwords, which resulted from the difference in interpretations assigned to them in mainstream and patriotic opposition discourses. As functional neologisms in the Russian language, the loanwords do not have sharply defined denotations. This lack of definition enabled them to cover a wide spectrum of possible reference. As Chapter 6 further explored, members of the patriotic opposition discourse recruited paraphrases of the loanwords to develop the strategies of delegitimisation through creative and mutually supportive uses of metaphor and irony. In this process, the semi-technical terms were transformed into ideological keywords and used to play a leading role in the disqualification of opposing perspectives. The study of Putin's speeches has revealed the other side of the barricade, that is how the dominant discourse of the ruling elite used metaphors to establish normative meanings and reinterpret competing discourses.

All of these analyses uncovered discursive instantiations of Soviet nostalgia as a preferred strategy of legitimation. Both discourses display ritualisation and references to already legitimate narratives in order to lend stability to new texts, which confirms observations by other scholars that the new modes of expression associated with emerging political systems can still be entangled in the past. The CPRF leader Zyuganov, for example, predictably speaks from the frame of legitimate Soviet time that is unquestioned by Communist supporters. Although importing some of the vocabulary of liberal democracy, such post-Communist

discourse continues to rely upon Soviet-style idioms while hankering for the lost ideals of Russia as a Great Power, and portraying the country as a victim of 'democratic' murder and/or as a broken-down entity. Putin's assertive foreign policy, his military success in Chechnya, as well as economic growth during his first presidency have accorded him the chance to articulate the discourse of Soviet stability, although he also freely borrows from a more distant past. In his speeches, the use of lexis associated with Soviet-era successes serves to evoke the associations of order and prosperity, much desired after years of turbulent reforms. Both leaders rely on creative play with metaphors to build references to the past, and in this way avoid the necessity to reflect on current experience.

The chronological study of these tendencies in connected texts has also exposed the work of centrifugal and centripetal forces in the Russian language. Although various types of lexical and stylistic borrowing had transformed Russian public discourse, centrifugal tendencies surfaced in the form of Soviet lexis and conventionalised phrases. The desire to make their texts stand out and have an impact on their readers prompts authors to elaborate on a stable stock of themes by using a broad range of lexicalisations. Since the best way to make a text memorable is to come up with more radical lexicalisations, key political terms are transferred from one text to another in the company of both existing and novel collocates, illustrating the tension between creative and restricting forces. Similarly, the development of metaphor vehicles constitutes another way of making one's lexicalisations more expressive and therefore more impressive. As the analysis of paraphrases containing the word *privatisation* has shown particularly clearly, however, such vehicle relexicalisations do not break away from well-trodden metaphoric paths. Rather, the conceptual frames are mostly set within traditional boundaries, that is constrained by an existing set of values and symbols that determine association with a social order.

The shift to the multi-party system under parliamentary democracy was a call for Russian politicians to actively construct their legitimacy in political dialogue, in contrast to previous exclusive reliance on Communist mythology (Boia, 2001). Yet, this study has revealed that during the second post-perestroika decade the conventionalisation of linguistic norms appears to go hand in hand with the usage of grand narratives. Although the opposing discourses studied in this book display predictable differences in the type of language resources used, common reliance on mythological elements as a means of legitimation is striking. A constant and important feature of political discourse that

lends it emotionality and coherence, myths nevertheless 'preclude the possibility of dialogue' and therefore are essentially anti-political (Sakwa, 2008: 203). In this regard, contributors to a recent edited volume (Wöll and Wydra, 2008) have shown how a close study of mythical elements in Eastern European discourses helps to account for the 'paradox of the victory of democracy without democrats' (p. 2). In the Russian context, the unquestioned legitimacy of the country's historic greatness, including Soviet-era achievements, as well as the weighty symbolism of its unique path, have enabled the transfer of legitimacy to politicians who articulate these mythological elements in their discourse.

Lingering Newspeak phenomena have recently been observed in mainstream post-totalitarian discourse across Europe (Andrews, 2011). Gorham (2009: 178), for example, notes that although 'competing discourses have emerged it takes little effort to recognise – be it in the rhetoric of a parliamentary debate or the eloquence of ultranationalist leaders – recourse taken to the well-established gift of tongues of the former party state'. The corpus-assisted analysis of post-Soviet discourse in this book has demonstrated that such nostalgia, accompanied by a ritualised use of earlier statements, is not an accidental phenomenon but a systematic feature across a number of thematically connected texts. The widespread and strategic use of such reminiscences of Communist reality calls for further studies of the rhetorical uses of nostalgia across the post-Soviet political spectrum. During the last stages of writing this book, Putin was re-elected for a third term, which has opened a timely, if unwelcome opportunity to explore how the re-emerging discursive orthodoxy examined here may be developed further.

8.3   Further directions

The theoretical and methodological elaboration of a corpus-assisted discourse analysis can find applications within the fields of media and political studies.

A particular focus of this book has been to treat a corpus as a flow of chronologically ordered text by monitoring changes and trends. This perspective can inform ongoing efforts to compile specialised corpora from online resources where intertextuality is one of the key characteristics (Koteyko, 2010). Although the highly dynamic nature of the Internet presents challenges only briefly outlined in this book, online texts increasingly provide an important getaway to the study of institutional and political discourse (Mautner, 2005). Whether one is interested in the development of an online discourse community or wants to

trace emergence of discourse phenomena on a more global level, a diachronic corpus-assisted study elaborated here can help trace intertextual connections as well as changes in the use of lexico-semantic resources.

Whereas compilation of national corpora in other languages has already received wide attention among corpus linguistics, initiatives that use specialised collections of texts for critical analysis of non-Western discourses are still in short supply. Current corpus-assisted studies of discourse are predominantly carried out on English texts – an imbalance that may deprive us of insights about alternative semiotic systems. As Blommaert points out: 'There is no reason to restrict critical analyses of discourse to highly integrated, Late Modern and post-industrial, densely semiotised First-World societies' (2005: 35). The process of corpora compilation and management discussed in this book provides an example of how individual researchers can start to remedy this imbalance, and help overcome the marginalisation of non-Western discourses in discourse scholarship (Shi-xu et al., 2005). Such corpora can advance in-depth studies of individual discourses as well as allow comparative investigation of phenomena observed primarily on the basis of English texts, such as conversationalisation, for example (Fairclough, 1995a).

I therefore hope that we shall see continued expansion in the compilation of special purpose corpora for the analysis of discourses produced by cultural communities different from those of the West. The use of such corpora in the study of the manifold workings of intertextuality can enrich the theory and practice of both discourse analysis and corpus linguistics; it would further bridge a divide between the two approaches and advance analyses of the unstable and disputed nature of meaning in discourse.

Appendix 1: Collocational Profiles of the Loanwords

The profiles below list collocates in descending order of frequency. Both the loanwords and collocates are presented as lemmas. Lemmas of the nodes are presented in upper case, whereas lemmas of collocates, for the sake of contrast, are shown in lower case. Nouns and adjectives of the same semantic root which do not differ significantly in their frequency of occurrence are presented as a single lemma. For example: *МЕНЕДЖЕР* 167 <*россия* (Russia), *доход* (income), *континенталь* (continental)>. Here the loanword *менеджер*, represented by the lemma *МЕНЕДЖЕР*, occurs 167 times in the corpus, accompanied by the collocates *россия* (Russia)*, доход* (income) and *континенталь (*continental) in descending order of frequency of their co-occurrence.

The loanword *business*

БИЗНЕС 395 <*россия* (Russia), *малый* (small), *крупный* (large-sized), *средний* (medium), *политика* (politics), *власть* (power), *заниматься* (do), *криминальный* (criminal), *представители* (representative), *частный* (private), *делать* (do), *большой* (big), *мелкий* (small-sized), *время* (time), *сфера* (sphere), *олигарх* (oligarch), *интерес* (interest), *страна* (country), *экономика* (economy), *деньги* (money), *государство* (state), *нефтяной* (oil), *русский* (Russian), *новый* (new), *условия* (conditions), *теневой* (shadow), *преступный* (criminal), *иметь* (have), *прибыльный* (profitable), *терроризм* (terrorism), *собственный* (one's own), *рабочие* (workers), *война* (war), *звездочный* (starry), *использовать* (use), *чиновники* (officials), *предприниматель* (entrepreneur), *продавать* (sell), *история* (story/history), *поддержка* (support), *год* (year), *доллары* (dollars), *отечественный* (national), *легальный* (legal), *компания* (company), *акулы* (sharks), *начало* (beginning), *национальный* (national), *алюминиевый* (aluminium), *главный* (main), *сообщество* (society), *западный* (Western), *труд* (labour), *челночный* (shuttle, as in 'shuttle trade'), *совесть* (conscience), *население* (population), *абрамович* (Abramovich), *возможность* (opportunity), *выгодный* (useful), *новорусский* (new Russian), *махинаторы* (fraudsters), *воротилы* (wheeler-dealers), *информация* (information), *деятельность* (activity), *мешать* (interfere), *народ* (people), *налоговый* (tax), *климат* (climate), *банкир* (banker), *брат* (brother), *грабеж* (robbery), *рынок* (market), *группировка* ((criminal) grouping), *доходный* (profitable), *так называемый* (so-called), *нынешний* (present day), *оборудование* (equipment), *приватизация* (privatisation), *паразиты* (parasites), *закон* (law), *работать* (work), *международный* (international), *лизинговый* (leasing), *кровь* (blood), *элита* (elites), *искусство* (art), *театральный* (theatre), *отмывание* (laundering), *кпрф* (CPRF), *капитал* (capital), *торговля* (trade), *взятки* (bribes), *камни* (stones), *капитализм* (capitalism), *незаконный* (illegal), *нелегальный* (illegal), *организатор* (organiser), *предательство* (betrayal), *правительство* (government)>.

The loanword *businessman*

БИЗНЕСМЕН 153 <*чиновник* (official), *политический* (political), *крупный* (large-sized), *российский* (Russian), *страна* (country), *деньги* (money), *криминальный* (criminal), *мелкий* (small-sized), *выражение* (expression), *предприниматели* (entrepreneurs), *президент* (president), *государство* (state), *дерьмократы* (derogative from democrats), *банкир* (banker), *власть* (power), *западный* (Western), *близкий* (close), *известный* (well-known), *коммунисты* (Communists), *олигарх* (oligarch), *большой* (big), *журналисты* (journalists), *американский* (American), *встреча* (meeting), *защитник* (protector), *честный* (honest), *преступник* (criminal), *средний* (medium), *иностранный* (foreign), *бандиты* (bandits), *безуспешный* (futile), *белорусский* (Byelorussian), *взятки* (bribes), *вор* (thief), *деловой* (business), *джентельмены* (gentlemen), *конкурент* (rival), *еврейский* (Jewish), *история* (history/story), *вопрос* (question), *кровавый* (bloody), *приватизация* (privatisation), *работать* (work), *сомнительный* (dubious), *чубайс* (Chubais), *економика* (economy)>.

The loanword *privatisation*

ПРИВАТИЗАЦИЯ 775 <*россия* (Russia), *государство* (state), *закон* (law), *предприятие* (enterprise), *итоги* (results), *пересмотр* (revision), *собственность* (property), *незаконный* (illegal), *ваучер* (voucher), *грабить* (plunder), *рынок* (market), *промышленный* (industrial), *ельцин* (Yeltsin), *имущество* (possessions), *вопрос* (question), *называть* (call), *президент* (president), *преступный* (criminal), *акции* (shares), *политика* (politics), *олигарх* (oligarch), *власть* (power), *реформы* (reforms), *земля* (soil), *монополия* (monopoly), *бандитский* (bandit), *муниципальный* (municipal), *осуществлять* (carry out), *крупный* (large-sized), *общество* (society), *завод* (plant/factory), *гайдар* (Gaidar), *говорить* (talk), *главный* (main), *механизм* (mechanism), *криминальный* (criminal), *обьект* (object), *необходимый* (necessary), *бюджет* (budget), *капитал* (capital), *правительство* (government), *ограбление* (robbery), *инвестиционный* (investment), *интерес* (interest), *возможность* (possibility), *директор* (director), *деньги* (money), *запад* (west), *белорусский* (Byelorussian), *дальнейший* (further), *завершать* (complete), *воровской* (larcenous), *контроль* (control), *компания* (company), *катастрофа* (catastrophe), *заявление* (statement), *богатства* (riches), *прихватизатция* (prikhvatisation/grabotisation), *иностранный* (foreign), *большинство* (majority), *вывод* (conclusion), *отечественный* (national), *рабочие* (workers), *ликвидация* (liquidation), *одиозный* (odious), *либерализация* (liberalisation), *выполнение* (implementation), *жилищный* (housing), *путин* (Putin), *обещание* (promise), *доллар* (dollar), *обвальный* (landslide), *верховный* (supreme), *антинародный* (antipeople), *обман* (fraud, deception), *доход* (earnings), *касьянов* (Kasianov), *обвинение* (accusation), *госимущество* (state property), *американский* (American), *директор* (director), *внешний* (external), *массовый* (massive), *расчленение* (dismemberment), *время* (time), *вызывать* (call), *дефолт* (default), *дивиденды* (dividends), *кредиты* (credits), *изьятие* (confiscation), *коррумпированный* (corrupted), *голос* (voice), *комплекс* (complex), *министерство* (ministry), *конституция* (constitution), *навязать* (impose), *развал* (breakdown), *защита* (protection), *халява* (freebie), *уголовный* (criminal, penal), *льготы* (benefits), *госдума* (State Duma), *выгода* (gain), *скандал* (scandal), *разорение* (ruin, devastation), *разрушительный* (destructive), *номенклатурный* (nomenclature), *парламент* (parliament), *стихийный*

(spontaneous), *убийство* (killing), *вопиющий* (outrageous), *кровавый* (bloody), *пресловутый* (notorious)>.

ПРИВАТИЗАЦИОННЫЙ (privatisational) 29. The word is infrequent and not many collocates were retrieved. The lexis co-occurring with this loanword is similar to the lexis collocating with *privatisation*.

The loanword *manager*

МЕНЕДЖЕР 167 <*россия* (Russia), *доходы* (profits), *континенталь* (continental), *управление* (management), *компания* (company), *финансовый* (financial), *фонд* (fund), *задача* (task), *коммунист* (Communist), *рыночник* (pro-market economist), *директор* (director), *собственность* (property), *получать* (obtain), *время* (time), *чубайс* (Chubais), *дилеры* (dealers), *высший* (highest), *политический* (political), *представитель* (representative), *новый* (new), *банкроты* (bankrupts), *бизнес* (business), *страна* (country), *великий* (great), *власть* (power), *экономический* (economic), *клерки* (clerks), *сообщить* (report), *президент* (president), *инженеры* (engineers), *федеральный* (federal), *рабочий* (worker), *работать* (work), *бандиты* (bandits), *государство* (state), *мошенник* (fraudster), *пахнуть* (smell), *прибыль* (profit), *проблемы* (problems), *спекулянты* (profiteers), *пропаганда* (propaganda), *сказочный* (fairy), *умелый* (skilful), *эффективный* (efficient)>.

The loanword *voucher*

ВАУЧЕР 93 <*чубайс* (Chubais), *приватизация* (privatisation), *стоимость* (value), *главный* (main), *российский* (Russian), *ваучеризация* (voucherisation), *бумажки* (pieces of paper), *экономика* (economy), *гражданин* (citizen), *деньги* (money), *провести* (carry out), *народ* (people), *ценный* (valuable), *скупать* (buy out), *фонды* (funds), *страна* (country), *этап* (stage), *обещать* (promise), *пресловутый* (notorious), *основной* (main), *цель* (objective), *цена* (price), *полный* (complete), *правда* (truth), *недовольный* (dissatisfied), *дефолт* (default), *заявлять* (state), *лексика* (lexis), *навязанные* (imposed), *проводник* (conductor), *называть* (call), *председатель* (chairperson), *ругательный* (invective), *рыночный* (market), слово (word), *сомнение* (doubt), *счет* (bill), *требовать* (demand), *бумаги* (papers)>.

ВАУЧЕРНЫЙ 17 <*приватизация* (privatisation), *чубайс* (Chubais), *страна* (country)>. The word is infrequent in the corpus and not many collocates can be observed. However, according to the contexts of its use, the word is used pejoratively in the majority of instances.

The loanword *default*

ДЕФОЛТ 48 <*август* (August), *кириенко* (Kirienko), *санитарный* (sanitary), *российский* (Russian), *банкротсво* (bankruptcy), *власть* (power), *время* (time), *герои* (heroes), *государство* (state), *доллар* (dollar), *завершать* (complete), *изъятие* (confiscation), *национальный* (national), *приватизация* (privatisation), *прошлогодний* (last year), *рынок* (market), *девальвация* (devaluation)>.

Appendix 2: Colligational Patterning of the Loanwords in the CPOP

The lists below present general grammatical patterns first, and then exemplify lexical realisations, i.e. collocations. For example, the colligational patterning of the loanword *manager* is presented as follows.

ADJ-N constructions

Великий (great), *лучший* (best), *удачливый* (lucky), *выдающийся* (outstanding), *классный* ('cool'), *профессиональный* (professional) (…)

N-N constructions

To the right of the node: *агенство* (agency), *компания* (company), *фонд* (fund), *фирма* (firm), *газпром* (Gazprom), *клуб* (club), *предприятие* (enterprise), *организация* (organisation)

The loanword *manager* is a noun, therefore in the first example we have collocations with adjectives: *великий менеджер* (a great manager), *лучший менеджер* (the best manager), etc. The second pattern (noun plus noun) is instantiated by collocations such as *менеджер агенства, менеджер компании, менеджер Газпрома*, etc., where the loanword is the first element in a construction (as is indicated by the phrase to the right of the node).

The loanword *business*

ADJ-N constructions

Малый (small), *средний* (middle-sized), *крупный* (large), *челночный* (shuttle), *незаконный* (illegal), *подпольный* (backstreet), *российский* (Russian), *преступный* (criminal), *теневой* (shadow), *частный* (private), *нефтяной* (oil), *молдавский* (Moldavian), *легальный* (legal), *криминальный* (criminal), *хороший* (good), *совместный* (joint), *прибыльный* (profitable), *челночный* (shuttle).

N-Ngen constructions

To the left: *воротилы* (wheeler-dealers), *представители* (representatives), *сфера* (sphere).

V+N constructions

бизнес as object: (1) *делать бизнес на чем-либо*; (2) *заниматься бизнесом*.

A certain degree of variation can be observed in this pattern. For example, the structure may appear as V + pronoun + N: *делать свой бизнес* and *заниматься своим бизнесом*. There is also a co-occurrence with the preposition *на* (on): *бизнес на девушках* (business on girls); *бизнес на крови* (business on blood).

N + V constructions – business as subject: *бизнес грабит… ; бизнес не желает иметь дело…*

The loanword *businessman*

Similar to the loanword *business*, the word *businessman* also displays the predominance of the ADJ-N grammatical pattern.

ADJ-N constructions

Немецкий (German), *российский* (Russian), *крупный* (large-sized), *средний* (middle-sized), *западный* (Western), *зарубежный* (foreign), *мелкий* (small-sized), *преуспевающий* (successful), *хороший* (good), *честный* (honest).

The loanword *privatisation*

ADJ-N constructions

Дикий (wild), *незаконный* (illegal), *преступный* (culpable), *ваучерный* (voucher), *чубайсовский* (Chubais), *массовый* (mass), *губительный* (harmful), *грабительский* (rapacious), *народный* (popular, public), *бесконтрольный* (uncontrollable), *широкомасштабный* (on a large scale), *спонтанный* (spontaneous), *чековый* (cheque), *российский* (Russian), *номенклатурный* (nomenclature), *криминальный* (criminal), *украинский* (Ukrainian), *разрушительный* (destructive), *олигархический* (oligarchic), *ельцинско-гайдаровский* (Yeltsin-Gaidar). Adjectives occurring only once: *хищнический* (predatory), *свинский* (swinish), *халявный* (freebie), *скрытый* (hidden).

N-Ngen constructions

To the left of the node: *план* (plan), *норма* (norm), *модель* (model), *отец* (father), *участник* (participant), *проведение* (implementation), *незаконность* (illegality), *история* (story), *итоги* (results), *архитектор* (architect), *акты* (acts), *сфера* (sphere), *последствия* (aftermath), *цели* (aims), *целесообразность* (practicability), *фонд* (fund), *механизм* (mechanism), *стратегия* (strategy), *объект* (object).

To the right of the node: *Предприятие* (enterprise), *госпакет* (state package), *госсобственность* (state property), *бюджет* (budget), *объект* (object), *комплекс* (complex), *здание* (building).

V–Noun constructions

Проводить (carry out), *осуществлять* (implement), *приостановить* (put on hold), *узаконить* (legalise).

The derivative *privatisational*

Adj-N constructions

Бумажки (pieces of paper), *афера* (swindle/crook business), *сделка* (deal), *затея* (ploy).

The loanword *manager*

ADJ-N constructions

Великий (great), *лучший* (best), *удачливый* (lucky), *выдающийся* (outstanding), *классный* ('cool'), *профессиональный* (professional), *продвинутый* (advanced), *эффективный* (effective), *топ-* (top), *старший* (senior), *молодой* (young), *наглый* (impertinent), *плохой* (bad), *умный* (clever), *сегодняшний* (today), *так называемый* (so-called), *кризисный* (crisis), *высший* (top), *финансовый* (financial), *политический* (political), *отечественный* (home).

N-Ngen constructions

To the right: *агенство* (agency), *компания* (company), *фонд* (fund), *фирма* (firm), *газпром* (Gazprom), *клуб* (club), *предприятие* (enterprise), *организация* (organisation).

The loanword *default*

Adj-N

прошлогодний (last year), *кириенковский* (Kirienko), *любой* (any), *последующий* (following), *финансовый* (financial).

N-Ngen

(to the left) *объявление* (announcement), *метод* (method), *обломки* (debris), *время* (time), *процесс* (process), *конец* (end).

Prepositional phrases

после дефолта (after the default), *во время дефолта* (during the default), *до дефолта* (before the default).

The loanword *voucher*

ADJ-N constructions

Главный (main, top), *пресловутый* (notorious), *ельцинско-чубайсовский* (Yeltsin-Chubais).

N-Ngen constructions

партия (party), *приобретение* (acquisition), *держатель* (holder), *номинал* (nominal), *стоимость* (value).

Notes

2 Perspectives on Corpus-Assisted Discourse Analysis

1. See Schiffrin (1994) for a detailed discussion of the different definitions of discourse in linguistics and discourse analysis.
2. For a definition of discursive rather than textual coherence, see Fruchtmann (2004a).
3. A clarification is in order with regard to the variety of labels given to the objects of lexical analysis in the studies focusing on the relationship between language and ideology. A number of scholars, for example Firth (1935), Williams (1961, 1983), Fairclough (1992), Wierzbicka (1997) and Stubbs (1996) who study lexical items as the embodiment of culture-specific information, use the term 'keyword'. However, the term is not strictly defined in linguistics. What a *keyword* stands for largely depends on the research perspective of the investigator, and can be used to discuss what represents the 'key' to the understanding of a text or dialogue. As Hermanns (1994: 43) puts it, it can be any word which 'unlocks' and reveals understanding of the object of investigation to us. By contrast, corpus-based studies use a more restricted definition of the term, relying on the criterion of keyness (Scott, 1997) in the statistical sense. Further on I use the terms 'catchwords' and 'ideologemes' to refer to words qualifying for the status of keywords in the socio-historical tradition, reserving the term 'keyword' for the description of statistically derived lexis.

3 Sociolinguistic Patterns and Discursive Stages in Post-Soviet Russia

1. Borrowing is a vast topic, and the term can be used to mean different things depending on whether a transfer of linguistic elements within one language is emphasised or whether the interaction between different languages is focused upon. This study uses the term 'borrowing' to mean both the process of element transition from one language into another, and the element which is carried during such transition.
2. 'Loanword' is an equally difficult term to use and define unambiguously, as lexicologists do not always agree the category in which to place a lexical item (for different classifications of loanwords, see Krysin, 1996, 2004). Here I focus primarily on an outright transfer of a lexeme from one language to another, rather than on borrowed phenomena such as loan translations or loan creations (Weinreich, 1974). However, in the discussion of text excerpts containing the loanwords some of these phenomena (for example the loan creations *прихватизация* and *демократ*) are accounted for.
3. Evaluative meaning, or evaluation, is a multiply defined term. In this study, the term is used in a broad sense, as an 'indication that something is good or bad' (Hunston, 2004: 19).

4. Russian politics is particularly entangled with mythology because of the tradition of messianism, which is, as Sakwa (2008: 203) observes, 'a term that in effect takes a myth and turns it into a national vision and a political programme'.

4   Compilation of Specialised Corpora

1. An overview of common statistical tests used in corpus linguistic software packages can be found in Stubbs (1996).
2. Not all of the newspapers included in the pilot corpus had offline printed versions. 'Gazeta' and 'RossBusinessConsulting' are examples of primarily Internet-based news resources.
3. One should bear in mind that novelty is a relative criterion. In lexicographic practice, neologisms are identified and 'fixed' in dictionaries (for example, such as 'Dictionary of New Words', 'New in the Russian Lexis') on the basis of their 'novelty' within a certain period of time. However, to qualify for inclusion in dictionaries a word must have been used with a certain frequency within the specified time period, and in this sense it can hardly be considered new. Therefore, what we call neologisms are, in fact, words that have been in circulation over a given period with some consistency (Teubert, 1998).
4. The sites were accessed in 2003 and some URLs have been changed or deleted since then.
5. At this stage, some problems with data collection had to be overcome. The actual number of texts turned out to be fewer than displayed in the results section, as the websites appeared to 'borrow' texts from each other without proper referencing. Also, technical problems with the search function of the newspaper archives prevented retrieval of some archived texts despite the fact that an exact path for location was given. Finally, it turned out to be problematic obtaining texts written in 1997. As the search returned only a few articles written or placed online in that year, I decided to exclude them from the sample, and start the compilation of the corpus from articles published in 1998.
6. The subcorpus is only a small part of the complete collection of the journal's texts running to 20 million words, which can be queried via online interface at the following website: http://www.sfb441.uni-tuebingen.de/b1/korpora. html [accessed June 2012].
7. On the question of Putin's language liberties see Orekh', A. 'Опечатка вместо шутки', *Ezhednevniy Zhurnal*, 8 October 2006, or 'Восстановите Путина', *Kommersant Vlast*, 9 May 2008.

5   Analysis of Quantitative Trends

1. Due to their status as neologisms in the Russian language and a rather limited corpus size, we cannot expect to find a large number of conventionalised phrases with the loanwords. The aim is not to identify fixed combinations but rather establish whether they form part of what Stubbs (2001) calls 'abstract semantic units, which have typical but variable lexical realizations' (2001: 102). In such a way, the emphasis is on the general tendencies or 'behaviour' of the loanwords in context, rather than the identification of

'lexical items' or 'units of meaning' in the sense of Tognini Bonelli (2001) and Sinclair (1991, 1996a, b).

2. Frequency is a major factor in organising corpus evidence and at this initial state of data processing recurrent events were given priority (the cut-off point is 2). It does not mean, however, that one-off events are necessarily ignored, rather, as Sinclair (2004: 28) points out, they 'cannot be evaluated in the absence of an interpretative framework provided by the repeated events'.

3. Semantic prosody is a controversial concept in the neo-Firthian tradition of corpus linguistics. Earlier discussions can be found in prominent works of Sinclair (1991, 1996 a, b), Louw (1993) and Stubbs (2001), whereas more recent debates are presented in Whitsitt (2005), Bednarek (2008), Stewart (2010) and McEnery and Hardie (2011).

4. The terminology is variable here. Louw (1993) and Sinclair (1996a), for example, use the term 'semantic prosody', while Stubbs (2001: 88) prefers the term 'pragmatic prosody', arguing that 'this would maintain a standard distinction between aspects of meaning which are independent of speakers (semantics) and aspects which concern speaker attitude (pragmatics)'. Tognini Bonelli (1996: 193–209) uses the term 'discourse prosody' to emphasise the function of speakers and hearers in creating discourse coherence.

5. Only the word *коммунисты* (Communists) appears on the keyword list. March (2001), however, maintains that the party is more 'Communist' than is generally acknowledged by pointing out its 'continued commitment to various elements of the Marxist–Leninist theoretical heritage' such as references to the exploitative nature of capitalism and the colonial aspirations of imperialism (2001: 264).

6. The phrase is used as a cover term to refer to all collocates which contain semantic components that may be interpreted as negative.

7. Because of space restrictions, collocational and colligational profiles of the loanwords in the RPC are not presented here.

8. I am grateful to John Sowerby for his assistance with English translations.

9. The example is taken from the article 'Черный кардинал Виктора Ющенко. За украинским премьером стоит глава движения «МИР»' (author A. Bogomolov) published online at www.pravda.ru on 4 April 2001 [accessed 5 January 2008].

10. As the loanword is infrequent in the RPC, the summary table has not been composed.

6   Diachronic Study of Paraphrases

1. As critics of the theory have shown, the notion of 'echo' cannot deal with all instances of irony (Partington, 2006). However, it is still useful for interpreting ironic expressions where resemblance to the original statement can be easily identified.

2. For reasons of space, only a small part of all analysed texts (37 using *privatisation*, 23 using the loanword *default* and 35 using *business*) could be cited here.

3. Unlike the loanwords, the expression *народный капитализм* can be traced to a particular author – Boris Nemtsov, formal leader of the Union of Right-Wing Forces. 'People's capitalism' rejects the notion of market forces as the only effective regulator of all spheres of economic and social life, although still

treats the market and private property as the pillars of a new Russian society (Chinayeva, 1996).

4. The State Duma (*Государственная дума*) is the lower house of the Federal Assembly of Russia. The Duma replaced the Supreme Soviet as a result of the new constitution introduced by Yeltsin in the aftermath of the constitutional crisis in 1993.

5. The phrase refers to Lenin's characterisation of nationwide electrification in 1920.

6. The term invokes the Soviet vocabulary and discourses of membership in a socialist society (Ciscel, 2011).

7. Famously performed by the Alexander Alexandrov, the song is calling the Soviet soldiers to surge forward in the struggle against the German Wehrmacht: *Вставай, страна огромная, Вставай на смертный бой. С фашистской силой темною…* [The huge country is rising, Is rising for the deathly battle, Against the dark fascist force …].

7   Metaphor Use in Political Speeches

1. Cf. Все путем – все идет хорошо. *Словарь воровского жаргона* http://mirslovarei. com/content_jar/Vse-Putem-889.html [accessed 14 June 2008].

2. Interestingly, in 2006, the pop group Kalinov Most wrote a hit song '*Все путем*'. The lyrics centre on the theme of the long path to the dreamland, which is represented by patriotic and Soviet-inspired nostalgic imagery of sleeping fighters and peaceful grain-producing fields of Kuban', washed with sweat and blood. The refrain of the song все *по замыслу, все путем* foregrounds the sense of the expression as a movement towards a predestined, almost providential goal (*как прописано*).

3. Lih cites Nikolay Bukharin's *Путь к социализму и рабоче-крестьянский союз* (Moscow, 1925), as a key text. See also E. H. Carr and R. W. Davies (1969: 45–6).

4. For more detail on the perestroika-specific employment of the construction metaphor, see Kaul (1989: 102) and Ermakova (1996: 47–9).

5. Arguably, the notion of 'the Russian idea' was coined by Dostoevsky in 1861 in his launch of the subscription to the journal *Vremya* (Gulyga, 2004: 7). This conception which derived from Slavophile views and which emphasised Russian culture as occupying a special place in the history of civilisation and a unique Russian identity was further developed, among others, by the philosophers Vladimir Solovyev and Nikolay Berdyaev.

6. Sergey Shoigu, 6 June 2006; http://www.edinros.ru/news.html?id=121105 [accessed 30 August 2008].

7. According to Kryshtanovskaya and White (2003: 296), the Kremlin strategists who engineered Putin's rise to power saw Putin as a 'reanimated Andropov' who would consolidate society, restore public order and strengthen state power.

References

Alatortseva, S. I. 1999. *Проблемы неологии и русская неография*. Avtoreferat dissertatsii. St Petersburg.

Allen, G. 2000. *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.

Althusser, L. 1971. Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In B. Brewster (trans.), *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. London: New Left Books, pp. 160–9.

Anderson, R. 1996. 'Look at all those nouns in a row': Authoritarianism, democracy, and the iconicity of political Russian. *Political Communication*, 13: 145–64.

Anderson, R. 2001. The discursive origins of Russian democracy. In R. D. Anderson et al. (eds), *Postcommunism and the Theory of Democracy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 96–125.

Andreeva, N. et al. 1997. *Словарь иностранных слов: актуальная лексика, толкования, этимология*. Moscow: Citadel.

Andrews, E. (ed.) 2011. *Legacies of Totalitarian Language in the Discourse Culture of the Post-Totalitarian Era: the Case of Eastern Europe, Russia, and China*. Lanham, Md: Lexington Books.

Aston, G. 1997. Small and large corpora in language learning. In B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and P. Melia (eds), *Practical Applications of Language Corpora*. Hamburg: Peter Lang, pp. 51–62.

Backhouse, A. 1992. Connotation. In W. Bright (ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 297–8.

Baker, P. 2005. *Public Discourses of Gay Men*. London: Routledge.

Baker, P. 2006. *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.

Baker, P. 2011. Times may change but we'll always have money: a corpus driven examination of vocabulary change in four diachronic corpora. *Journal of English Linguistics,* 39: 65–88.

Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., Khosravinik, M., Krzyzanowski, M., McEnery, T., Wodak, R. 2008. A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK Press. *Discourse and Society*, 19 (3): 273–306.

Baker, P. and McEnery, T. 2005. A corpus-based approach to discourses of refugees in UN and newspaper texts. *Journal of Language and Politics,* 4 (2): 197–226.

Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogical Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. 1984. *Problems of Dostoyevsky's Poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press.

Barthes, R. 1993. *Mythologies*. Selected and translated from *Mythologies* (1957) by A. Lavers. London: Vintage.

Barzilay, R. and Lee, L. 2002. Bootstrapping lexical choice via multiple-sequence alignment. *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pp. 164–71.

Bazerman, C. 1994. Systems of genres and the enactment of social intentions. In A. Freedman and P. Medway (eds), *Genre and the New Rhetoric*. London: Taylor and Francis, pp. 79–101.

Bazerman, C. 2004. Intertextuality: How texts rely on other texts. In C. Bazerman and P. Prior (eds), *What Writing Does and How it Does it: an Introduction to Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 83–96.

Bednarek, M. 2008. Semantic preference and semantic prosody re-examined. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory,* 4(2): 119–39.

Berntsen, D. and Kennedy, J. 1996. Unresolved contradictions specifying attitudes – in metaphor, irony, understatement and tautology. *Poetics*, 24: 13–29.

Beumers, B., Hutchings, S. and Rulyova, N. (eds) 2008. *The Post-Soviet Russian Media. Conflicting Signals*. London and New York: Routledge.

Biber, D. 1993. Representativeness in corpus design. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 8(4): 243–57.

Blackledge, A. 2005. *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Blommart, J. 2005. *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boia, L. 2001. *History and Myth in Romanian Conciousness*. Budapest and New York: Central European University Press.

Bolotova, E. and Zinken, J. 2004. Das russische und das deutsche Europa: Bauwesen-Metaphorik im russischen und im deutschen Europa-Diskurs. In S. Bracic, D. Cuden, S. Podgorsek and V. Pogacnik (eds), *Linguistic Studies in the European Year of Languages: Proceedings of the 36th Linguistic Colloquium*, Ljubljana 2001. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. 1996. *The State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourmeyster, A. 1998. The restructuring of Soviet political discourse. In P. Chilton, M. Ilyin and J. L. Mey (eds), *Political Discourse in Transition in Europe 1989–1991,* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 69–87.

Breeze, R. 2011. Critical discourse analysis and its critics. *Pragmatics*, 21 (4): 493–525.

Breivik, L. and Jahr, E. (eds) 1989. *Language Change*: *Contributions to the Study of its Causes*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Breslauer, G. 2005. Regimes of political consolidation: the Putin presidency in Soviet and post-Soviet perspective. In Alex Pravda (ed*.), Leading Russia: Putin in Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 37–58.

Busse, D. 2003. Diskursanalyse in der Sprachgermanistik – Versuch einer Zwischenbilanz und Ortsbestimmung. In U. Haß and C. König (eds), *Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik*. Marbach: Wallstein, pp. 175–87.

Busse, D., Hermanns, F. and Teubert, W. (eds) 1994. *Begriffsgeschichte und Diskursgeschichte. Methodenfragen und Forschungsergebnisse der historischen Semantik*. Opladen: Westdeutsche Verlag.

Cameron, L. 1999. Operationalising metaphor for applied linguistic research. In L. Cameron and G. Low (eds), *Researching and Applying Metaphor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3–28.

Cameron, L. 2010. The discourse dynamics framework for metaphor. In L. Cameron and R. Maslen (eds), *Metaphor Analysis: Research Practice in Applied Linguistics, Social Sciences and the Humanities*. London: Routledge, pp. 77–98.

Cameron, L. and Deignan, A. 2003. Combining large and small corpora to investigate tuning devices around metaphor in spoken discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol,* 18 (3): 149–60.

Cameron, L. and Deignan, A. 2006. The emergence of metaphor in discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, 27 (4): 671–90.

Cap, P. 2006. *Legitimisation in Political Discourse: a Cross-Disciplinary Perspective on the Modern US War Rhetoric*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carr, E. and Davies, R. 1969. *Foundations of a Planned Economy, 1926–1929*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Carter, R. 2004. *Language and Creativity: the Art of Common Talk*. London: Routledge.

Carvalho, A. 2008. Media(ted) discourse and society: Rethinking the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Journalism Studies*, 9 (2): 161–77.

Channell, J. 2000. Corpus-based analysis of evaluative lexis. In G. Hunston and S. Thompson (eds), *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 38–55.

Charteris-Black, J. 2004. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Charteris-Black, J. 2005. *Politicians and Rhetoric. The Persuasive Power of Metaphor.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Charteris-Black, J. 2007. *The Communication of Leadership: the Design of Leadership Style*. London and New York: Routledge.

Charteris-Black, J. 2009. Metaphor and political communication. In A. Musolff and J. Zinken (eds), *Metaphor and Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 97–115.

Cheung, L. 2007. How to paraphrase: Significant evidence for knowledge building. Module 2 submission in part fulfilment of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The University of Birmingham. Unpublished manuscript.

Chilton, P. 1996. *Security Metaphors: Cold War Discourse from Containment to Common European Home*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Chilton, P. 2004. *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice.* London: Routledge.

Chilton, P. and Ilyin, M. 1993. Metaphor in political discourse. The case of the 'Common European House'. *Discourse and Society*, 4 (1): 7–31.

Chilton, P. and Schäffner, C. 2002. Introduction. Themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse. In P. Chilton and C. Schäffner (eds), *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, Pa: John Benjamins, pp. 1–41.

Chinayeva, E. 1996. Boris Nemtsov, a rising star of the Russian provinces. *Transitions*, 2 (4): 36–8.

Chudinov, A. 2001. *Россия в метафорическом зеркале: когнитивное исследование политической метафоры (1991–2000)*. Ekaterinburg: the Urals State Pedagogical University.

Chudinov, A. 2003. *Метафорическая мозаика в современной* политической коммуникации. Ekaterinburg: the Urals State Pedagogical University.

Ciscel, M. 2011. What does democracy mean in Moldova? In E. Andrews (ed.), *Legacies of Totalitarian Language in the Discourse Culture of the Post-Totalitarian*

Era: the Case of Eastern Europe, Russia, and China. Lanham, Md: Lexington Books.

Clear, J. 1993. From Firth principles. Computational tools for the study of collocation. In M. Baker, G. Francis and E. Tognini-Bonelli (eds), *Text and Technology. In Honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 271–92.

Cohen, A. 2006. 'Putin's legacy and United Russia's new ideology', Heritage Foundation , 1 June 2006, http://www.heritage.org/Research/RussiaandEurasia/bg1940.cfm

De Beugrande, R. 2001. Large corpora, small corpora, and the learning of 'language'. In Robert Rosebery, Alex Henry and Mohsen Ghadsessy (eds), *Small Corpus Studies and ELT: Theory and Practice*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 3–28.

Deignan, A. 1999. Corpus-based research into metaphor. In L. J. Cameron and G. D. Low (eds), *Researching and Applying Metaphor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 177–99.

de Smaele, Hedwig 1999. The applicability of Western models on the Russian media system. *European Journal of Communication*, 14(2): 173–89.

Drew, P. and Heritage, J. 1992. *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dubin, B. 2005. *Посторонние: власть, масса и массмедиа в сегодняшней России. Otechestvennye zapiski* 6.

Duguid, A. 2010. Investigating anti and some reflections on modern diachronic CADS. *Corpora*, 5(2): 191–220.

Dulichenko, A. 1994. *Русский язык конца XX столетия*. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner.

Dunn, J. 1999. The transformation of Russian from a language of the Soviet type to a language of the Western type. In J. Dunn (ed.), *Language and Society in Post-Communist Europe. Selected Papers from the 5th World Congress of Central and Eastern European Studies,* Warsaw, 1995. Basingstoke and New York: Macmillan, pp. 3–11.

Eggins, S. and Martin J. R. 1997. Genres and registers of discourse. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as Structure and Process*. London: Sage, pp. 230–56.

Ermakova, O. P. 1996. *Семантические процессы в лексике*. In E. A. Zemskaya (ed.), *Русский язык конца XX столетия*. Moscow: Yazyki russkoi kultury, pp. 32–66.

Fairclough, N. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. 1995a. *Critical Discourse Analysis: the Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. 1995b. *Media Discourse*. London, New York, Sydney and Auckland: Edward Arnold.

Fairclough, N. 2000. *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. 2001. *Language and Power*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Ferrari, F. 2007. Metaphor at work in the analysis of political discourse: Investigating a 'preventive war' persuasion strategy. *Discourse and Society*, 18(5): 603–25.

Firth, J. 1935. The technique of semantics. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 36–72.

Firth, J. R. 1951/57. Modes of meaning. In *Papers in Linguistics 1934–51* by J. R. Firth. London: Oxford University Press.

Fish, M. 2001. Putin's path. *Journal of Democracy,* 12(4): 71–8.

Flikke, G. 1999. Patriotic left-centrism: the zigzags of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 51(2): 275.

Flowerdew, J., Li, D. C. S. and Tran, S. 2002. 'Discriminatory news discourse: Some Hong Kong data'. *Discourse & Society*, 13(3): 319–45.

Flowerdew, L. 2005a. An integration of corpus-based and genre-based approaches to text analysis in EAP/ESP: Countering criticisms against corpus-based methodologies. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24: 321–32.

Flowerdew, L. 2005b. The argument for using English specialized corpora to understand academic and professional language. In U. Connor and T. Upton (eds), *Discourse in the Professions: Perspectives from Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Foucault, M. 1972/1989. *Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Fowler, R. 1991. *Language in the News. Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.

Fruchtmann, J. 2004a. *К проблеме анализа крупных фрагментов текста - применение прикладного анализа политического дискурса.* In V. Krasnikh and A. Izotov (eds), *Филологический факултет МГУ: Язык, сознание, коммуникация,* 26. Moscow: Maks Press, pp. 5–24.

Fruchtmann, J. 2004b. 'Oligarkhiia' – zum Werdegang eines politischen Schlagwortes. In M. Bayer, M. Betsch and A. Gattnar (eds), *Beiträge der Europäischen Slavistischen Linguistik*. Munich: Otto Sagner, pp. 43–52.

Gergen, K. and Gergen, M. 1991. Toward reflexive methodologies. In F. Steier (ed.), *Research and Reflexivity*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, pp. 76–95.

Gibbs, R. 1999. Researching metaphor. In L. Cameron and G. Low (eds), *Researching and Applying Metaphor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 30–47.

Glasgow University Media Group. 1976. *Bad News*. London: Routledge.

Glasgow University Media Group. 1980. *More Bad News*. London: Routledge.

Glasze, G. 2007. Vorschläge zur Operationalisierung der Diskurstheorie von Laclau und Mouffe in einer Triangulation von lexikometrischen und interpretativen Methoden. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 8(2), Art. 14, http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0702143 [accessed: 4 February 2011].

Goatly, A. 1997. *The Language of Metaphors*. London: Routledge.

Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gorham, M. 2006. Language culture and national identity in post-Soviet Russia. In I. Lunde and T. Roesen (eds), *Landslide of the Norm: Language Culture in Post-Soviet Russia*. Bergen: Slavica Bergensia.

Gorham, M. 2009. Linguistic ideologies, economies, and technologies in the language culture of contemporary Russia (1987–2008). *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 17 (1–2): 163–92.

Gorshkov, M. 2004. *Образ Сильных мира сего в массовом сознании*. In *Ekonomicheskaia elita Rossii v zerkale obshchestvennogo mneniia*. Moscow: IKSI RAN, pp. 6–22.

Goscilo, H. (ed.) 2012. *Putin as Celebrity and Cultural Icon*. London: Routledge.

Greene, S. 2009. Shifting media and the failure of political communication in Russia. In B. Beumers, S. C. Hutchings and N. Rulyova (eds), *The Post-Soviet Russian Media: Conflicting Signals*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 56–71.

Gulyga, A. 2004. Русская идея как постсовременная проблема. In E.A. Vasil'ev (ed.), *Русская идея: Сборник произведений русских мыслителей*. Moscow: Airis-press, pp. 5–24.

Guseinov, G. 2004. *ДСП: Советские идеологемы в русском дискурсе 1990-х*. Moscow: Tri kvadrata.

Hahn, G. 2002. *Russia's Revolution from above, 1985–2000: Reform, Transition, and Revolution in the Fall of the Soviet Communist Regime*. Transaction Publishers: New Brunswick, USA.

Hall, G. 2005. *Literature in Language Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1978. *Language as Social Semiotic: the Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. 2006. Afterwords. In G. Thompson and S. Hunston (eds), *System and Corpus*. London: Equinox, pp. 293–300.

Hardt-Mautner, G. 1995. Only connect. Critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics. University of Lancaster. [Available at http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/computing/research/ucrel/tech_papers.html]. Accessed 2 February 2008.

Hart, C. 2008. Critical discourse analysis and metaphor: Toward a theoretical framework. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 5 (2): 91–106.

Hartley, J. 1982. *Understanding News*. London: Methuen.

Hassner, P. 2008. Russia's transition to autocracy. *Journal of Democracy*, 19, (2): 5–15.

Hellsten, I. 2000. Dolly: Scientific breakthrough or Frankenstein's monster? Journalistic and scientific metaphors of cloning. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 15 (4): 213–21.

Hermanns, F. 1994. *Schlüssel-, Schlag- und Fahnenwörter. Zu Begrifflichkeit und Theorie der lexikalischen „politischen Semantik"*. Arbeiten aus dem Sonnerforschungsbereich 245. Heidelberg/Mannheim.

Hodge, R. and Kress, G. 1993. *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge.

Hoey, M. 2000. Persuasive rhetoric in linguistics: a stylistic study of some features of the language of Noam Chomsky. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds), *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 28–38.

Howarth, D. 2002. An archaeology of political discourse? Evaluating Michel Foucault's explanation and critique of ideology. *Political Studies*, 50: 117–35.

Hunston, S. 2002. *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hunston, S. 2004. Counting the uncountable: Problems of identifying evaluation in a text and in a corpus. In A. Partington, J. Morley and L. Haarman (eds), *Corpora and Discourse*. Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 157–88.

Hunston, S. 2007. Semantic prosody revisited. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 12(2): 249–68.

Hunston, S., Francis, G. and Manning, E. 1997. Grammar and vocabulary: Showing the connections. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 51(3): 208–15.

Hutcheon, L. 1995. *Irony's Edge: the Theory and Politics of Irony*. London: Routledge.

Ishiyama, J. 2006. Europeanization and the Communist successor parties in post-Communist politics. *Politics & Policy,* 34: 3–29.

Johnson, M. 1987. *The Body in the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jucker, A. H. 1996. Das Fremde in der eigenen Sprache: Fremdwörter im Deutschen und im Englischen. In L. Bredella and H. Christ (eds), *Begegnungen*

mit dem Fremden. Gießen: Verlag der Ferberschen Universitätsbuchhandlung, pp. 233–47.

Kamberelis, G. and Scott, K. 1992. Other people's voices: the coarticulation of texts and subjectivities. *Linguistics and Education,* 4: 359–403.

Karoly, K. 2002. *Lexical Repetition in Text.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Kaul, M. 1989. Breakthrough and blind alley: the lexicon of perestroika. In P. Chilton, M. Ilyin and J. Mey (eds), *Political Discourse in Transition in Europe 1989–1991.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 95–111.

Khimik, V. V. (2000) *Поэтика низкого, или просторечие как культурный феномен.* St Petersburg: Filologicheskiy fakultet SbPU.

Kimmel, M. 2009. Metaphors of the EU constitutional debate – ways of charting discourse coherence in a complex metaphor field. *Metaphorik.de,* 17.

Kitis, E. and Milapides, M. 1997. Read it and believe it: How metaphor constructs ideology in news discourse; a case study. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 28: 557–90.

Kjellmer, G. 1987. Aspects of English collocations. In W. Meijs (ed.), *Corpus Linguistics and Beyond.* Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 133–40.

Klein, J. (ed.) 1989. *Politische Semantik. Bedeutungsanalytische und sprachkritische Beitrage zur politischen Sprachverwendung.* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Koller, V. 2003. Metaphor clusters, metaphor chains: Analyzing the multifunctionality of metaphor in text. *Metaphorik.de,* 05: 115–34.

Koller, V. and Mautner, G. 2004. Computer applications in critical discourse analysis. In Ann Hewings et al. (eds), *Applying English Grammar.* London: Arnold, pp. 216–28.

Koltsova, O. 2006. *News, Media and Power in Russia.* London: Routledge.

Komlev, N. G. 1995. *Словарь новых иностранных слов.* Moscow: Moscow State University.

Korten, D. C. 1999. *When Corporations Rule the World.* London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.

Kostomarov, V. G. 1994. *Языковой вкус эпохи,* 1st edn. Moscow: Pedagogika-Press.

Kostomarov, V. G. 1997. *Языковой вкус эпохи (из наблюдений над речевой практикой масс-медиа),* 2nd edn. Moscow: Pedagogika-Press.

Kostomarov, V. G. 2005. *Наш язык в действии: Очерки современной русской стилистики.* Moscow: Gardariki.

Kostomarov, V. G. and Burvikova, N. D. 2001. *Старые мехи и молодое вино.* St Petersburg: Zlatoust.

Koteyko, N. 2007. A diachronic approach to meaning in corpus linguistics: the use of English loanwords in Russian opposition discourse. *Corpora,* 3: 65–95.

Koteyko, N. 2010. Mining the Internet for linguistic and social data: an analysis of 'carbon compounds' in web feeds. *Discourse & Society,* 21 (6): 655–74.

Koteyko, N. 2012. Managing carbon emissions: a discursive presentation of 'market-driven sustainability' in the British media. *Language and Communication,* 32: 24–35.

Koteyko, N., Brown, B. and Crawford, P. 2008a. The dead parrot and the dying swan: the role of metaphor scenarios in UK press coverage of avian flu in the UK in 2005–2006. *Metaphor and Symbol,* 23(4): 242–61.

Koteyko, N., Jaspal, R. and Nerlich, B. 2013. Climate change and 'climategate' in online reader comments: a mixed methods study. *The Geographical Journal,* 179(1): 74–86.

Koteyko, N., Nerlich, B., Crawford, P. and Wright, N. 2008b. 'Not rocket science' or 'no silver bullet'? Media and government discourses about MRSA and cleanliness. *Applied Linguistics*, 29: 223–43.

Kövecses, Z. 2002. *Metaphor: a Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Krasnoboka, N. 2003. The Russian media landscape. [Available at http://www.ejc.nl/jr/emland/russia.html]. Accessed 30 July 2008.

Kreuz, R. and Roberts, R. 1995. Two cues for verbal irony: Hyperbole and the ironic tone of voice. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity,* 10(1): 21–31.

Krishnamurthy, R. 1996. Ethnic, racial and tribal: the language of racism?. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard and M. Coulthard (eds), *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge, pp. 129–49.

Kristensson, G. 1977. Anglo-amerikanische Einflüsse in DDR-Zeitungstexten unter Berücksichtigung semantischer, pragmatischer, gesellschaftlich-ideologischer, und English über alles quantitativer Aspekte. *Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Stockholmer Germanistische Forschungen 23*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Kristeva, J. 1980. *Desire in Language*. *A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Krysin, L. P. 1996. *Иноязычное слово в контексте современной общественной жизни*. In E. A. Zemskaya (ed.), *Русский язык конца XX столетия* (1985–1995). Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kulturi, pp. 142–59.

Krysin, L. P. 1998. *Толковый словарь иноязычных слов*. Moscow: Russkii yazik.

Krysin, L. P. 2000. *Русский язык сегодня.* Moscow: Azbukovnik.

Krysin, L. P. 2004. *Русское слово, свое и чужое.* Moscow: Yaziki russkoi kul'turi.

Kryshtanovskaya, O. and White, S. 2003. Putin's militocracy. *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 19 (4): 289–306.

Kupina, N. A. 1995. *Тоталитарный язык: Словарь и речевые реакции*. Perm: Ural State University.

Kytö, M. 1996. *Manual to the Diachronic Part of the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Coding Conventions and Lists of Source Texts*. University of Helsinki: Department of English.

Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.

Lakoff, G. 2004. *Don't Think of an Elephant: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*. White River Junction, Vt: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leech, G. 2002. Recent grammatical change in English: Data, description, theory. In Karin Aijmer and Bengt Altenberg (eds), *Proceedings of the 2002 ICAME Conference*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Rodopi, pp. 61–81.

Lemke, J. 1995. *Textual Politics*. London: Longman.

Lih, L. 2006. The Soviet Union and the road to Communism. In Ronald G. Suny (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Russia*, vol. 3, *The Twentieth Century*. Cambridge University Press.

Louw, B. 1993. Irony in the text or insincerity of the writer? The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies. In M. Baker, G. Francis and E. Tognini-Bonelli (eds), *Text and Technology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 157–76.

Louw, B. 2000. Contextual prosodic theory: bringing semantic prosodies to life. In C. Heffer, H. Sauntson and G. Fox (eds) *Words in Context: a Tribute to John Sinclair on his Retirement.* Birmingham: University of Birmingham, pp. 48–94.

Lozovskii, L. et al. 1997. *Универсальный бизнес-словарь.* Moscow: Infa-M.

Lunde, I. and Roesen, T. (eds) 2006. *Landslide of the Norm. Language Culture in Post-Soviet Russia.* Bergen: Slavica Bergensia.

Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McDaniel, T. 1996. *The Agony of the Russian Idea.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

McEnery, A. M. and Hardie, A. 2011. *Corpus Linguistics: Method, Theory and Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McFaul, M. and Stoner-Weiss, K. 2007. The myth of the authoritarian model: How Putin's crackdown hurt Russia. *Foreign Affairs*, 87 (1): 68–84.

Macgilchrist, F. 2011. *Journalism and the Political: Discursive Tensions in International News Coverage of Russia.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Malinova, O. 2009. Russian political discourse in the 1990s. Crisis of identity and conflicting pluralism of ideas. In P. Casula and J. Perovic (eds), *Identities and Politics during the Putin Presidency: the Discursive Foundations of Russia's Stability.* Stuttgart: Ibidem-Verlag, pp. 94–107.

March, L. 2001. For Victory? The crises and dilemmas of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 53 (2): 263–90.

March, L. 2002. The *Communist Party in Post-Soviet Russia*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

March, L. 2003. The pragmatic radicalism of Russia's Communists. In J. Leftwich Curry and J. Barth Urban (eds), *The Left Transformed in Post-Communist Societies: the Cases of East-Central Europe, Russia, and Ukraine.* Lanham, Md: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 163–208.

Maslennikova, A. 2008. Putin and the tradition of the interview in Russian discourse. In B. Beumers, S. Hutchings and N. Rulyova (eds), *The Post-Soviet Russian Media. Conflicting Signals.* London and New York: Routledge, pp. 89–105.

Mautner, G. 2005. Time to get wired: Using web-based corpora in critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 16(6): 809–28.

Mautner, G. 2007. Mining large corpora for social information: the case of the elderly. *Language in Society*, 36 (1): 51–72.

Mautner, G. 2009. Checks and balances: How corpus linguistics can contribute to CDA. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* London: Sage, pp. 122–43.

Medvedev, P. N. (1978). *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship: a Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics.* Trans. Albert J. Wehrle. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.

Meyer, M. 2001. Between theory, method, and politics: Positioning of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* London: SAGE Publications.

Mokienko, V. 1998. *Доминанты языковой смуты постсоветского времени. Russistik*, 1–2: 37–56.

Mokienko, V. 1999. The Russian language 'on the brink': the linguistic situation in present-day Russia. In J. Dunn (ed.), *Language and Society in Post-Communist*

Europe. Selected Papers from the 5th World Congress of Central and Eastern European Studies, Warsaw, 1995. Basingstoke and New York: Macmillan, pp. 70–85.

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

Musolff, A. 2006. Metaphor scenarios in public discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol,* 21 (1): 23–38.

Musolff, A. and Zinken, J. (eds) 2009. *Metaphor and Discourse.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Neidhart, C. 2003. *Russia's Carnival: the Smells, Sights, and Sounds of Transition.* Lanham, Md: Rowman and Littlefield.

Nelson, M. 2000. A corpus-based study of business English and business English teaching materials. Unpublished PhD thesis. Manchester: University of Manchester.

Nerlich, B. and Clarke, D. 2003. Anatomy of a media event: how arguments clashed in the 2001 human cloning debate. *New Genetics and Society*, 22: 43–59.

Nerlich, B. and Koteyko, N. 2009. MRSA – portrait of a superbug: a media drama in three acts. In A. Musolff and J. Zinken (eds), *Metaphor and Discourse.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 153–73.

Nordenstreng, K. and Pietiläinen, J. 2010. Russian media as a mirror of change. In *Witnessing Change in Contemporary Russia.* Kikimora Publications Series B, no. 38. Helsinki: Kikimora Publications, pp. 136–58.

Novikov, V. A. 1994. *Толковый словарь. Термины рыночной экономики.* Moscow: Nauka.

Oates, S. 2009. The neo-Soviet model for the media. In B. Beumers, S. Hutchings and N. Rulyova (eds), *Globalisation, Freedom and the Media after Communism. The Past as Future.* London and New York: Routledge, pp. 37–55.

O'Halloran, K. 2007. Critical discourse analysis and the corpus-informed interpretation of metaphor at the register level. *Applied Linguistics*, 28: 1–24.

Okara, A. 2007. Sovereign democracy: a new Russian idea or a PR project? *Russia in Global Affairs*, 2.

Orpin, D. 2005. Corpus linguistics and critical discourse analysis. Examining the ideology of sleaze. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 10 (1): 37–61.

Parry-Giles, S. and Parry-Giles, T. 2000. Collective memory, political nostalgia, and the rhetorical presidency: Bill Clinton's commemoration of the March on Washington August 28, 1998. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 86: 417–37.

Parshina, O. 2004. *Стратегии и тактики речевого поведения современной политической элиты России.* Astrakhan.

Parshina, O. 2005. Ritoricheskii portret V.V. Putina. In M. A. Kormilitsyna and O. B. Sirotinina (eds), *Problemy rechevoi kommunikatsii.* Saratov: Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo universiteta, pp. 25–34.

Partington, A. 2003. *The Linguistics of Political Argument.* Routledge: London.

Partington, A. 2004. 'Utterly content in each other's company': Semantic prosody and semantic preference. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 9 (1): 131–56.

Partington, A. 2006. *The Linguistics of Laughter.* Routledge: London.

Partington, A. 2010. Modern diachronic corpus-assisted discourse studies (MD-CADS) on UK newspapers: an overview of the project. *Corpora*, 5(2): 83–108.

Partington, A. 2012. The changing discourses on antisemitism in the UK press from 1993 to 2009. A modern-diachronic corpus-assisted discourse study. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 11 (1): 51–76.

Partington, A., Morley, J. and Haarman, L. (eds) 2004. *Corpora and Discourse*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Pearson, J. 1998. *Terms in Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Pêcheux, M. 1982. *Language, Semantics and Ideology: Stating the Obvious*. London: Macmillan.

Pennycook, A. 1994. Incommensurable discourses? *Applied Linguistics*, 15(2): 115–38.

Pfitzner, J. 1978. *Der Anglizismus im Deutschen. Ein Beitrag zur Bestimmung seiner stilistischen Funktion in der heutigen Presse*. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Philip, G. 2011. *Colouring Meaning: From Collocation to Connotation.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Philo, G. 2007. Can discourse analysis successfully explain the content of media and journalistic practice? *Journalism Studies*, 8 (2): 175–96.

Piper, A. 2000. Lifelong learning, human capital, and the soundbite. *Text*, 20: 109–46.

Pöppel, L. 2007. *The Rhetoric of Pravda Editorials: a Diachronic Study of a Political Genre*. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis: Stockholm Slavic Studies, 33.

Pragglejaz Group. 2007. MIP: a method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22 (1): 1–39.

Rathmayer, R. 1991. *Von Коммерсантъ bis джаст-ин-тайм: Wiederbelebungen, Umwertungen und Neubildungen im Wortschatz der Perestroika*. Slavistische Linguestik 1990: Referate des XVI. Konstanzer Slavistischen Arbeitstreffens. Bochum: Löllinghausen, pp. 189–232.

Reisigl, M. and Wodak, R. 2001. *Discourse and Discrimination*. London: Routledge.

Reisigl, M. and Wodak, R. 2009. The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds), *Methods of CDA*. London: Sage, pp. 87–121.

Renouf, A. 1987. Corpus Development. In J. Sinclair (ed.), *Looking Up. An Account of the COBUILD Project*. London: Collins, pp. 1–40.

Richardson, J. E. 2007. *Analysing Newspapers: an Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Richardson J, and Wodak R. 2009. Recontextualising fascist ideologies of the past: Right-wing discourses on employment and nativism in Austria and the United Kingdom. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 6 (4): 251–67.

Rodríguez González, F. (ed.) 1996. *Spanish Loanwords in the English Language: a Tendency towards Hegemony Reversed*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ryabov, A. 2012. Communist Party of the Russian Federation (KPRF). *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Encyclopædia Britannica Online. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2012. <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/1235250/Communist-Party-of-the-Russian-Federation>.

Ryazanova-Clarke, L. 2005. Criminal rhetoric in Russian political discourse. *Language Design*, 6: 141–60.

Ryazanova-Clarke, L. 2008a. Re-creation of the nation: Orthodox and heterodox discourses in post-Soviet Russia. *Scando-Slavica*, 54: 223–39.

Ryazanova-Clarke, L. 2008b. Putin's nation: Discursive construction of national identity in direct line with the president. *Slavica Helsingiensia*, 34: 311–31.

Ryazanova-Clarke, L. 2008c. What's in a foreign word: Negotiating linguistic culture on Russian radio programmes about language. In B. Beumers and S. Hutchins (eds), *The Mass Media in Post-Soviet Russia*. London: Routledge, pp. 105–23.

Ryazanova-Clarke, L. 2008d. On constructing perestroika: Mikhail Gorbachev as an agent of linguistic heresy. In E. Andrews (ed.), *Linguistic Changes in Post-Communist Eastern Europe and Eurasia*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 103–31.

Ryazanova-Clarke, L. 2009. How upright is the vertical? Ideological norm negotiation in Russian media discourse. In Ingunn Lunde and Martin Paulsen (eds*), From Poets to Padonki: Linguistic Authority and Norm Negotiation in Modern Russian Culture*. Bergen: Slavica Bergensia, pp. 288–315.

Ryazanova-Clarke L. and Wade, T. 1999. *The Russian Language Today*. London: Routledge.

Sakwa, R. 2004. *Putin: Russia's Choice*. London: Routledge.

Sakwa, R. 2008. Myth and democtratic identity in Russia. In A. Woll and H. Wydra (eds), *Democracy and Myth in Russia and Eastern Europe*. London: Routledge.

Saussure, F. de 1974. *Course in General Linguistics*. London: Fontana/Collins. (Originally published in French, 1915.)

Schäffner, C. 1997. Editorial: Political speeches and discourse analysis. In C. Schaffner (ed.), *Analysing Political Speeches*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 1–4.

Schiffrin, D. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schön, D. and Rein, M. 1994. *Frame Reflection: Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies*. New York: Basic Books.

Schröder, H. 2008. What kind of political regime does Russia have? In S. White (ed.), *Politics and the Ruling Group in Putin's Russia*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1–22.

Scott, M. 1997. PC analysis of key words and key key words. *System*, 25 (2): 233–45.

Scott, M. 2011. *WordSmith Tools 6*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Seale, C., Ziebland, S. and Charteris-Black, J. 2006. Gender, cancer experience and Internet use: a comparative keyword analysis of interviews and online cancer support groups. *Social Science and Medicine*, 62: 2577–90.

Segal, J. 1997. Public discourse and public policy: Some ways that metaphor constrains health (care). *Journal of Medical Humanities,* 18: 217–31.

Sekine, S. 2005. Automatic paraphrase discovery based on context and keywords between NE pairs. *Proceedings of International Workshop on Paraphrase (IWP-05),* Jeju Island, Korea, pp. 80–7.

Shalom, C. 1997. That great supermarket of desire: Attributes of the desired other in personal advertisements. In K. Harvey and C. Shalom (eds), *Language and Desire*, London: Routledge, pp. 186–203.

Shaposhnikov, V. 1998. *Russian Speech in the 1990s. Contemporary Russia as Reflected in Language*. Moscow: MALP.

Sheigal, E. 2000. *Semiotika politicheskogo discursa*. Moscow-Volgograd.

Shevtsova, L. 1999. *Yeltsin's Russia: Myths and Reality*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Shevtsova, L. 2003. *Putin's Russia*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Shevtsova, L. 2007a. *Russia – Lost in Transition. The Yeltsin and Putin Legacies*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Shevtsova, L. 2007b. Post-Communist Russia: a historic opportunity missed. *International Affairs*, 83(5): 891–912.

Shi-xu, Kienpointner, M. and Servaes, J. (eds) 2005. *Read the Cultural Other: Forms of Otherness in the Discourses of Hong Kong's Decolonisation*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Shlapentokh, V. 2003. Hobbes and Locke at odds in Putin's Russia. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 55(7): 981–1008.

Sigley, R. and Holmes, J. 2002. Looking at girls in corpora of English. *Journal of English Linguistics,* 30(2): 138–57.

Sinclair, J. (ed.) 1987. *Looking Up: an Account of the COBUILD Project in Lexical Computing.* London: Collins.

Sinclair, J. 1991. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. 1995. Corpus typology – a framework for classification. In G. Melchers and B. Warren (eds), *Studies in Anglistics*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, pp. 17–33.

Sinclair, J. 1996a. The empty lexicon. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics,* 1: 99–120.

Sinclair, J. 1996b. The search for units of meaning. *Textus*, 9: 75–106.

Sinclair, J. 2004. The lexical item. In J. Sinclair and R. Carter (eds), *Trust the Text. Language, Corpus and Discourse*. London: Routledge, pp. 131–48.

Slade, G. 2006. Deconstructing the millennium manifesto: the Yeltsin–Putin transition and the rebirth of ideology. *Vestnik*, 4 (online version, accessed 12 Aug. 2010): http://www.sras.org/deconstructing_the_millennium_manifesto.

Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. 1981. Irony and the use–mention distinction. In P. Cole (ed.), *Radical Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 295–318.

Stewart, D. 2010. *Semantic Prosody: a Critical Evaluation*. London: Routledge.

Strauß, G. et al. 1989. *Brisante Wörter von Agitation bis Zeitgeist. Ein Lexikon zum öffentlichen Sprachgebrauch*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Stubbs, M. 1996. *Text and Corpus Analysis: Computer-Assisted Studies of Language and Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Stubbs, M. 1997. Whorf's children: Critical comments on critical discourse analysis (CDA). In A. Ryan and A. Wray (eds), *Evolving Models of Language*. Clevedon: BAAL in association with Multilingual Matters, pp. 110–16.

Stubbs, M. 1998. German loanwords and cultural stereotypes. *English Today*, 14 (1): 19–26.

Stubbs, M. 2001. *Words and Phrases. Corpus Studies of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Suspitina, T. 1999. The rape of Holy Mother Russia and the hatred of femininity: the representation of women and the use of feminine imagery in the Russian nationalist press. *The Anthropology of East Europe Review*, 17(2): 114–23.

Swales, J. 1990. *Genre Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swan, R. 2002. 'Yes, but is it gender?' In L. Litosseliti and J. Sunderland (eds), *Gender Identity and Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 43–67.

Tannen, D. 1989. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tannock, S. 1995. Nostalgia critique. *Cultural Studies*, 9(3): 453–64.

Tardy, C. 2009. 'Press 1 for English': Textual and ideological networks in a news-paper debate on US language policy. *Discourse & Society*, 20 (2): 265–86.

Terdiman, R. 1985. *Discourse/Counter-Discourse: the Theory and Practice of Symbolic Resistance in Nineteenth-Century France*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Teubert, W. (ed.) 1998. *Neologie und Korpus*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Teubert, W. 1999. Corpus linguistics – a partisan view. *TELRI Newsletter*, 8/99: 4–19.

Teubert, W. 2003. Writing, hermeneutics and corpus linguistics. *Logos and Language*, 4 (2): 1–17.

Teubert, W. 2005a. My version of corpus linguistics. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 10 (1): 1–13.

Teubert, W. 2005b. Evaluation and its discontents. In E. Tognini-Bonelli, Elena and Gabriella Del Lungo Camiciotti (eds), *Strategies in Academic Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thibault, P.J. 1991. *Social Semiotics as Praxis*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minneapolis Press.

Threadgold, T. 1997. *Feminist Poetics: Poeisis, Performance, Histories*. London/New York: Routledge.

Timofeeva, G. G. 1995. *Новые английские заимствования в русском языке.* St Petersburg: Juna.

Tognini Bonelli, E. 1996. *Corpus Theory and Practice*. Birmingham: TWC Monographs.

Tognini Bonelli, E. 2001. *Corpus Linguistics at Work*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tolz, V. 1998. Forging the nation: National identity and nation building in post-Communist Russia. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 50 (6): 993–1022.

Townson, M. 1992. *Mother-Tongue and Fatherland. Language and Politics in German*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Tribble, C. 1998. Genres, keywords, teaching: Towards a pedagogic account of the language of project proposals. In L. Burnard (ed.), *Teaching and Language Corpora 98. Proceedings of the 1998 TALC Conference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tribble, C. 2000. Genres, keywords, teaching: Towards a pedagogic account of the language of project proposals. In L. Burnard and T. McEnery (eds), *Rethinking Language Pedagogy from a Corpus Perspective*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 75–90.

Tsipko, A. 1996. Why Gennady Zyuganov's Communist Party finished first. *Demokratizatsiya,* 4 (2): 185–200.

Urban, M. 1994. The politics of identity in Russia's postcommunist transition: the nation against itself. *Slavic Review*, 53 (3): 733–65.

Urban, M. 1996. Stages of political identity formation in late Soviet and post-Soviet Russia. In V. Bonnell (ed.), *Identities in Transition: Eastern Europe and Russia after the Collapse of Communism*. Berkeley: Center for Slavic and East European Studies. University of California, pp. 140–54.

Urban, M. 1998. Remythologising the Russian State. *Europe–Asia Studies*, 50(6): 969–92.

Ustinova, I. and Bhatia, T. 2005. Convergence of English in Russian TV commercials. *World Englishes,* 24(4): 495–508.

Valero, C. 2006. An *ad hoc* corpus in public service interpreting. Issues of design and applicability. In A. Hornero et al. (eds), *Corpus Linguistics: Applications for the Study of English*. Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 451–62.

Van Dijk, T. A. 1991. *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge.

Van Dijk, T. A. 1998. Opinions and Ideologies in the press. In A. Bell and P. Garrett (eds), *Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 21–64.

Van Dijk, T. A. 2009. *Society and Discourse. How Social Contexts Control Text and Talk.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Leeuwen, T. 1996. The representations of social actors. In C. R. Caldas Coulthard and M. Coulthard (eds), *Texts and Practices – Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge, pp. 32–70.

Voloshinov, V. N. 1973. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. New York and London: Seminar Press.

Voloshinov, V. 2000. Multiaccentuality and the sign. In L. Burke, T. Crowley and A. Girvin (eds), *The Routledge Language and Cultural Theory Reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 39–47.

Weinreich, U. 1974. *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton.

Weiss, G. and Wodak, R. (eds) 2003. *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

White, S. 2010. Soviet nostalgia and Russian politics. *Journal of Eurasian Studies,* 1 (1): 1–9.

White, S. 2011. *Understanding Russia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

White, S., Sakwa, R. and Hale, H. (eds) 2010. *Developments in Russian Politics 7*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Whitsitt, S. 2005. A critique of the concept of semantic prosody. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 10(3): 283–305.

Widdowson, H. 1995. Discourse analysis: a critical view. *Language and Literature*, 4 (3): 157–72.

Widdowson, H. 2004. *Text, Context, Pretext*. Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis. Oxford: Blackwell.

Widdowson, H. 2008. Language creativity and the poetic function. A response to Swann and Maybin (2007). *Applied Linguistics*, 29 (3): 503–8.

Wierzbicka, A. 1997. *Understanding Cultures through Their Keywords: English, Russian, Polish, German and Japanese*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Williams, G. 2002. In search of representativity in specialised corpora. *Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 7(1): 43–64.

Williams, R. 1961. *Culture and Society 1780–1950*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Williams, R. 1983. *Keywords: a Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. London: Fontana Press.

Wodak, R. (ed.) 1989. *Language, Power and Ideology: Studies in Political Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wodak, R. 2004. Discourses of silence. In L. Thiesmeyer (ed.), *Discourse and Silencing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 179–209.

Wodak, R. 2006. Mediation between discourse and society: Assessing cognitive approaches in CDA. *Discourse Studies,* 8 (1): 179–90.

Wodak, R. 2009. *The Discourse of Politics in Action*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wodak, R. 2011. Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis. In J. Östman, P. Ledin and J. Verschueren (eds), *Discursive Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 50–69.

Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. and Liebhart, K. (eds) 1999. *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds) 2009. *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.

Wöll, A. and Wydra, H. 2008. *Democracy and Myth in Russia and Eastern Europe.* London: Routledge/Curzon/BASEES series on East European and Slavonic Studies.

Yurchak, A. 2003. Soviet hegemony of form: Everything was forever until it was no more. *Comparative Studies in Society and Histo*ry, 45 (3): 480–510.

Zassoursky, I. 2004. *Media and Power in Post-Soviet Russia*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Zassoursky, I. 2009. Free to get rich and fool around. In B. Beumers et al. (eds), *The Post-Soviet Russian Media. Conflicting Signals.* London and New York: Routledge, pp. 29–41.

Zemskaya, E. A. (ed.) 1996. *Русский язык конца XX столетия* (1985–1995). Moscow: Yaziki russkoi kul'turi.

Zinken, J., Hellsten, I. and Nerlich, B. 2008. Discourse metaphors. In R. M. Frank, R. Dirven, T. Ziemke and E. Bernárdez (eds), *Body, Language and Mind*, vol. 2: *Sociocultural Situatedness*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 363–86.

Zybatow, L. 1995. *Russisch im Wandel: Die russische Sprache seit der Perestrojka.* Wiesbaden: Slavistische Veröffentlichungen 80.

Index