

Advances in Discourse Approaches

Advances in Discourse Approaches

Edited by

Marta Dynel

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS

P U B L I S H I N G

Advances in Discourse Approaches, Edited by Marta Dynel

This book first published 2009

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2009 by Marta Dynel and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-0609-9, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-0609-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
--------------------	---

Part I: Political Discourse and Ideology

Chapter One.....	4
------------------	---

Where Lexicon Meets Cognition: Can Crisis Construction
and Legitimization of Policies Be Studied through Lemma Patterns?

Piotr Cap, University of Łódź

Chapter Two	33
-------------------	----

Deictic Centre and Conceptualisation of Clusivity: A Case Study
of Barack Obama's Pre-Election Speeches

Anna Ewa Wieczorek, University of Łódź

Chapter Three	53
---------------------	----

A Functional Analysis of the New Testament Dialogues: Ideology
in Light of Functional Sentence Perspective

Martin Adam, Masaryk University

Part II: Specialist Discourses

Chapter Four	76
--------------------	----

Discourse Approaches to Specialised and Popular Academic English:
Comparing Stance, Hedges and Modality

Josef Schmied, Chemnitz University of Technology

Chapter Five	92
--------------------	----

A Note on Legal Discourse Semantics and J.L. Austin's Theory
of Speech Acts

Iwona Witczak-Plisiecka, University of Łódź

Chapter Six	112
-------------------	-----

Communicating Legal Knowledge. An Exploratory Multi-Dimensional
Study of Legal Academic Genres

Stanisław Goźdz-Roszkowski, University of Łódź

Part III: Everyday and Popular Media Discourses

Chapter Seven.....	130
Unspeakable Words: The Taboo Fringe of the Lexicon	
David Singleton, Trinity College	
Chapter Eight.....	147
The Role of Questions in Talk Shows	
Anita Schirm, University of Szeged	
Chapter Nine.....	174
'Laughter' in L2 Computer-Mediated Discourse	
Charlotte Taylor, University of Siena	
Chapter Ten	201
Add Humour To Your Ad: Humour in Advertising Slogans	
Marta Dynel, University of Łódź	
Chapter Eleven	227
Bakhtinian Dialogical Communication and Pragmatic Markers	
Bledar Toska, University of Vlora	

Part IV: Comparative Discourse Studies

Chapter Twelve	246
Different Languages, Different Contextualization Resources:	
Politeness and Discourse Strategies in English and in Japanese	
Ippei Inoue, Keio University	
Chapter Thirteen.....	268
Semantic and Pragmatic Functions of GA-Clefts in Japanese	
Chiaki Kumamoto, Saga University	

Part V: Discourse Translation

Chapter Fourteen	290
Functional Equivalence and Domestication Strategies in Film Translation	
Ilaria Parini, University of Milan	

Chapter Fifteen	317
Translating Language-Specific and Culture-Specific Humor for the Screen: The Case of <i>Sex and the City</i> Julia Stelter, University of Regensburg	

Part VI: Discourse and Teaching

Chapter Sixteen	340
Orthographic Depth and Psycholinguistic Grain Size: An Attempt to Explain Differences in Reading Accuracy and Speed Across Languages Joanna Nijakowska, University of Łódź	
Chapter Seventeen	365
Building L2 Communicative Confidence through Interlingual Tasks; Towards Function-Focused L2 Learning Bogusława Whyatt, Adam Mickiewicz University	
Index	389

INTRODUCTION

The study of discourse is a diversified and fast-developing field of language research, embracing methodological proposals, discourse analyses, comparative research, translation studies and teaching perspectives. Within each of the approaches, theoretical frameworks and postulates abound. The list of research topics is inexhaustible, especially that each year brings new real-life material for analyses and issues to elaborate.

This collection of peer reviewed articles is the result of an international conference on Discourse Approaches held in Poland. Each chapter is devoted to a different topic and deploys a separate theoretical framework. The diversity of the research data, methodologies and theoretical viewpoints guarantees the volume's being a representative sample of multifarious developments in discourse approaches. This book should thus be an interesting resource for enterprising scholars and students of linguistics, covering the whole gamut of linguistic topics from many a theoretical viewpoint.

The first part of the book comprises papers which focus on political discourse and ideology. Two authors expound on political discourse with the use of novel methodologies, viz. lemma patterns approach to crisis construction and legitimisation of policies and the notions of deictic centre and clusivity applied in the analysis of Barack Obama's speeches. The third contribution views New Testament dialogues from a functional sentence perspective.

The second part of the volume embraces three articles on specialist registers. The first one concentrates on specialised and popular academic English, paying special attention to stance, hedges and modality, while the other two subscribe to studies on legal language. One of the articles presents legal discourse semantics in the light of the speech act theory, and the other offers a multidimensional study of legal academic genres.

Part three is oriented towards analyses of linguistic phenomena found in everyday and popular media discourses. Papers address issues which do not appear to have received sufficient scholarly interest so far, i.e. taboo language, questions in talk shows, humorous advertising slogans, laughter in computer-mediated discourse between the teacher and the non-native student, as well as pragmatic markers in a dialogical perspective.

The two topics covered in the fourth part of book are subsumed under comparative studies. Both the papers tackle the pragmatics of Japanese and English, approaching politeness issues and the problem of GA-clefts.

The penultimate part represents translation studies. The two articles therein belong to the strand of audiovisual translation, concentrating on strategies in film translation, notably Quentin Tarantino's film references rendered in Italian, and the German translation of language-specific and culture-specific humour in "Sex and the City".

The last part is comprised of two papers on the discourse-teaching interface. The first paper examines orthographic depth and psycholinguistic grain size, and the second one raises the issue of building L2 learners' communicative confidence through interlingual tasks.

PART I:

POLITICAL DISCOURSE AND IDEOLOGY

CHAPTER ONE

WHERE LEXICON MEETS COGNITION: CAN CRISIS CONSTRUCTION AND LEGITIMIZATION OF POLICIES BE STUDIED THROUGH LEMMA PATTERNS?

PIOTR CAP, UNIVERSITY OF ŁÓDŹ

1. Introduction

This paper is a sequel to my earlier work on *proximization* (cf. Cap 2006, 2008), which I consider a cornerstone strategy in obtaining legitimization effects in political (interventionist) discourse. I take legitimization in the CDA-favored sense of linguistic enactment of the speaker's right to be obeyed (cf. Chilton 2004, 2005; Fairclough 2000, 2006; Fairclough and Wodak 1997; Van Dijk 1998; Weiss and Wodak 2003; Wodak and Chilton 2005, etc.). The claim to rightness and the resulting enactment of legitimization mean that the speaker's rhetoric is grounded in his implicit claim to inhabit a particular social or political role, and to possess a particular authority (cf. Van Dijk 1998, 2005; Martin and Wodak 2003). The possession of authority, usually accompanied by the asserted absence thereof in the audience or in the adversary, provides argumentative rationale (cf. Van Eemeren and Grootendorst 2004; Dedaic 2006, etc.) for listing reasons to be obeyed. Listing such reasons usually involves a symbolic assignment of different ideological principles to different parties on the discourse stage (cf. Reisigl and Wodak 2001, Chilton 2004, etc.), assertion of the addressee's wants in the moment of crisis (cf. Graham, Keenan and Dowd 2004, Martin and Wodak 2003, Hodges and Nilep 2007, Lakoff 1996, etc.), and construal of charismatic leadership matched against an emerging threat (cf. Chilton 1996, Chilton and Lakoff 1995, Chouliaraki 2007, Hodges and Nilep 2007, etc.). All these goals and techniques are addressed in the present paper, which organizes them into a formal discussion of how cognitive and especially

axiological aspects of legitimization can be studied through lemma patterns. Proximization is a pragmatic-cognitive strategy that draws on the speaker's ability to present the events on the discourse stage as directly affecting the addressee, usually in a negative or a threatening way. In Cap (2006, 2008) I have defined three aspects of proximization (spatial, temporal, axiological) which conceptually bind the entities localized inside the *deictic center* (cf. Chilton 2004, 2005) of the stage (speaker, addressee, the so-called *IDCs*) with the alien, outside-the-deictic-center entities (*ODCs*). The spatial aspect of proximization involves construal of the ODC-instigated events as physically endangering the IDCs, i.e., the addressee and the speaker. The temporal aspect involves presenting the events as momentous and historic and thus of central significance to both the addressee and the speaker. The axiological aspect, which this paper is gradually concentrating on, involves a clash between the system of values adhered to by the speaker and the addressee on the one hand, and, on the other, the values characterizing the ODCs (whose actions threaten the IDC entities). The cumulative result of application of the three proximization strategies, spatial, temporal and axiological, is legitimization. It is assumed that addressees tend to legitimize the speaker's pre-emptive actions against the ODC threat if they construe it as personally consequential.¹

2. The STA proximization model, thus far and current goals

The *spatial-temporal-axiological* (*STA*) model of proximization proposed in Cap (2006, 2008) presupposes the constancy of the macro function of legitimization within a defined timeframe. If, as a result of external factors, geopolitical changes, etc., one strategy of proximization is downplayed or abandoned, the overall balance and legitimization effects are usually redressed by an increase in the salience of another strategy. The functional redressability of proximization has been tentatively verified in Cap (2006, 2008), in pilot corpus studies on the language of the US administration during the Iraq war, between March 2003 (commencement of the allies' military operations in Iraq) and June 2004 (delegation of

¹ Since this paper uses data from the American political rhetoric, one could draw a working analogy between the IDC-ODC dichotomy and the traditional, post-isolationist 'Us vs. Them' divide (cf. e.g. Huntington 2004). In the process of proximization the ideological as well as physical distance between 'Us' and 'Them' is construed as shrinking, which eventually produces a clash. To prevent the clash, the speaker solicits legitimization of pre-emptive actions, which are thus in direct, personal interest of his audience ('Us', i.e. IDCs).

select executive powers to the new Iraqi interim government). I have analyzed the total of 64 presidential addresses within the two functionally distinct phases of the period: "Phase One," March-November 2003, and "Phase Two," December 2003-June 2004.² The conclusions have been that while the former sees as the major premise for war the alleged possession of weapons of mass destruction (henceforth: WMD) by the Saddam's regime, the latter is dominated by a "compensatory" rhetoric (mostly ideological), aimed at keeping the legitimization of the Iraqi intervention in place despite the already substantiated failure of the WMD argument.³ The changes in the extralinguistic reality i.e. in the geopolitical context of the conflict have shown to affect the proximization pattern applied throughout the entire involvement period.

It has been postulated that in Phase One texts there is a dominance of spatial-temporal proximization, which follows from the US administration's easy access to the WMD premise for legitimization of the pre-emptive strike in Iraq (cf. Silberstein 2004). The discourse stage is thus construed in predominantly spatial-temporal terms; for instance, the analogy to 9/11 events is built to invoke the aura of physical danger closing in to impact the IDC entities. However, the later loss of the main argument for going to war (i.e. the alleged possession of weapons of mass destruction by the Hussein's regime) means a gradual but consistent redefinition of the pro-war rhetoric and hence a change in the overall proximization pattern. What happens in Phase Two is thus a decline in the spatial-temporal proximization and a corresponding increase in the more universally appealing axiological proximization (cf. Pomeroy 2005). The latter's principal function is to broaden the geopolitical spectrum of the Iraqi conflict and to deepen its ideological anchoring (cf. Chang and Mehan 2006), thereby claiming legitimization on a more global scale. At the same time the collapse of the original argument is downplayed and the WMD intelligence failure is construed in terms of an isolated incident in a series

² The 64 presidential speeches on the Iraq war, covering the period March 2003–June 2004, were downloaded, in July 2004, from the official White House site <http://www.whitehouse.org>. All 64 speeches on Iraq available from the site in July 2004 were used in analysis, there were no left-out cases.

³ Similar points are raised in a number of journalistic texts on the Iraq war. They indicate a gradual change of the rhetorical stance, from emphasizing the closeness and immediacy of physical threat, to ideological juxtapositions and boundary-making. The change is, however, attributed not only to the WMD factor, but also to Bush's attempts at softening his rhetoric in general, to save the dwindling approval ratings. See, for instance: *USA Today*, Nov. 23, 2003; *Washington Post*, Nov. 2, 2003; *Boston Globe*, Jan. 2, 2004.

of successful operations governed by irrefutable ideological tenets (cf. Cap 2006, 2008).

These conceptual shifts have thus far been only partly corroborated in corpus research. In Cap (2008) there is a proposal for the framework of spatial-temporal (S/T) proximization which makes possible the abstraction of the key lemmas responsible for the enactment of S/T proximization in both Phase One and Phase Two of the Iraq war. The particular categories of the framework seem to work fine in elucidating the phase differences in the lexical counts; they clearly indicate the dominance of S/T proximization in Phase One, as well as its diminishing value in Phase Two. They are, however, incapable of explaining in the same lexical terms the essence of axiological proximization. Notably, it has been pre-postulated that axiological argument can keep the overall legitimization pattern intact, notwithstanding the decrease in the salience of the S/T strategy. Thus, the current task is to formalize the description of the axiological aspect of proximization, in order to show i) how axiological proximization works as a result of the interaction of language forms captured in different categories of the axiological proximization framework, and ii) what kind of potential it exhibits for the redressability of the general function of legitimization, whenever there is a diminishing input from another proximization strategy.

In what follows I first review the S/T framework (cf. Cap 2008) for its explanatory power as regards the reflection of the extralinguistic (geopolitical) changes in the type and degree of the proximization strategy applied over time. Then, using the same Phase One – Phase Two data of the 64 presidential texts, I provide an original postulate for the axiological framework. The four categories of the axiological framework are meant to encompass the language forms responsible collectively for not only the operation of axiological (A) proximization in its own right, but also for the functioning of the A strategy as compensation for the absence of another strategy, specifically the spatial-temporal one. Altogether, the envisaged account of the S/T-A mutual redressability is an attempt at refining the STA model of proximization in terms of further formalization of the dialogue between the conceptual and the lexical constituents of legitimization. In other words, we want to delve deeper in the methodological question *how cognitive constructs can be studied through the analysis of lexical configurations*. From an interpretive standpoint, the application of the refined model in the present paper not only makes the critical discussion of the rhetoric of the Iraq war more organized and precise, but, potentially, opens up interesting research avenues for other applications within the field of political (interventionist) discourse. These

may involve a number of issues which the model of proximization takes for granted in its own composition: the construal of crisis situation, symbolic distancing, ideological categorization, threat inflation, and more.

3. The spatial-temporal (S/T) proximization framework

I argue in Cap (2008) for a six-category framework of spatial-temporal proximization which applies directly to the rhetoric of the Iraq war, but potentially, to any kind of discourse which seeks legitimization of a pre-emptive reaction to a seemingly imminent threat. The six categories of the framework, involving traditional syntactic units such as noun and verb phrases, express a variety of conceptualizations of the discourse stage elements which differ in their deictic status:

- 1) Noun phrases (NPs) conceptualized as elements of the deictic center (IDCs);
- 2) NPs conceptualized as elements outside the deictic center (ODCs);
- 3) Verb phrases (VPs) of motion and directionality conceptualized together as indicators of movement of ODCs towards the deictic center and vice versa;
- 4) VPs of action conceptualized as indicators of contact between ODCs and IDCs;
- 5) NPs expressing abstract notions conceptualized as anticipations of potential contact between ODCs and IDCs;
- 6) NPs expressing abstract notions conceptualized as effects of actual contact between ODCs and IDCs.

Let us first identify these six categories in a sample text from the Iraqi corpus. Consider an excerpt from the US ultimatum urging Saddam Hussein to leave Iraq within 48 hours to avoid war. The ultimatum was issued on March 17, 2003:

[...] The danger is clear: using chemical, biological or, one day, nuclear weapons, obtained with the help of Iraq, the terrorists could fulfill their stated ambitions and kill thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people in our country, or any other. [...] The United States and other nations did nothing to deserve or invite this threat. But we will do everything to defeat it. Instead of drifting along toward tragedy, we will set a course toward safety. Before the day of horror can come, before it is too late to act, this danger will be removed [...]

To start with categories 1) and 2), the IDC elements involve lexical items and phrases such as “United States,” “other nations,” “innocent people,” “our country,” “we,” etc. The conceptualization of indefinite entities (cf. “other nations”) as members of the deictic center occurs through the implication of mutual relation, or sameness, triggered by the conjunction “and.” At the other end of the event stage are the ODCs: “Iraq,” “terrorists” and “their ambitions.” Again, a relation of shared identity is established between some of these elements. “Iraq” and “terrorists” are put on common ground through the presupposition of lasting cooperation (viz. “help”), and the sheer proximity of their lexical occurrence in the text. The relative distance between IDCs and ODCs is shrinking as a result of two processes: a) the ODC elements are construed as aspiring to physically affect the IDC territory (“kill thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people in our country”), which invokes the aura of “catastrophe” or “tragedy” (not-yet explicitly stated as such); b) the IDC elements are construed as partly inert and thus sooner or later exposed to contact with ODCs, a clash resulting in “tragedy” (stated explicitly to fit in with the previously invoked aura). These two processes involve lexical items from all the four remaining categories: 3) (“drifting toward”), 4) (“kill”), 5) (“danger,” “threat”), and 6) (“tragedy,” “horror”). The presence of elements representing, within a markedly short text sample such as above, all of the six categories distinguished, goes a long way towards proving the pervasiveness of spatial-temporal proximization in the Iraq war and, specifically, in its early stage (“Phase One”) which sees a consistent attachment to the WMD premise for war. But there is perhaps more to the picture and the S/T framework might be in need of complementation from a less “tangible” module. Moving beyond the proposed category distinction and looking at the use of modality in the quoted excerpt, it can be postulated that the process of spatial-temporal proximization is heavily aided by the “zooming in” on the probability of the conflict. First, a relatively remote possibility is drafted (“could fulfill their stated ambitions”), only to be replaced by a more concrete prediction (“before the day of horror can come”). Such a strategy can hardly be accounted for in “spatial” or “temporal” terms alone for it relies on the construal of the initially *ideological* conflict which turns, over time, into a *physical* threat. Thus, it binds together the spatial-temporal and the ideological ingredients of proximization, leading to *axiological* considerations addressing the issue of the spatial/temporal-axiological dynamics (and fuzziness!) of the discourse stage. Arguably, there exist some entities (cf. *threat*) whose construal as evidently “spatial,” “physical” or not (i.e. not yet) depends on how radical or physically consequential has been the development of

events on the discourse stage before the conceptualization takes place. Thus the S/T parameter alone might be insufficient to explain some of the more temporally-extensive legitimization processes, characteristic of a growing likelihood of construal shifts occurring as a result of extralinguistic (viz. geopolitical) changes. I shall take these important observations as a starting point for the discussion of the relationship between the “S/T” and the “A” proximization strategies later in the paper.

For now, the explanatory power of the S/T framework gets substantiated if we abstract the key lemmas and major phraseological concordances representing each of the six categories (some of the key lemmas can in fact be abstracted directly from the quoted text) and compare their frequency of occurrence in the 34-text corpus of Phase One, both among themselves and against the only slightly smaller, 30-text corpus of Phase Two. Since the difference in the overall number of words in both corpora is negligible, such a quantitative comparison provides a fertile ground for qualitative considerations:

Table 1. Phase differences in the number of lemmas defining spatial-temporal framework of the Iraq war rhetoric

Category	Key Lemma/Concordance ⁴		Phase One	Phase Two
1.	<i>United States or America</i>		426	613
	<i>free and/or democratic world</i> (inclusive of synonyms such as <i>people</i>)		194	415
2.	<i>Iraq</i>		330	165
	<i>terrorists</i>		255	112
3.	<i>head</i> (of IDCs, followed by preposition and ctg. 6 abstract NP, like in <i>head toward tragedy</i> , inclusive of multiple passive synonyms such as <i>drift</i>)		126	41
	<i>expand</i> (of ODCs)	with reference to <i>WMD</i>	88	6
		without reference to <i>WMD</i>	61	55

⁴ Inclusive of pronouns where applicable.

4.	<i>destroy</i> (of ODCs)		105	30
	<i>confront</i>	of ODCs	18	38
		of IDCs	47	31
5.	<i>threat</i>		127	52
	<i>danger</i>		96	51
6.	<i>tragedy</i>		60	55
	<i>catastrophe</i>		45	7

These corpus data yield important observations, drawn from both the “vertical” and the “horizontal” readings, where the former involve comparison of frequency hits of different lemmas within the exclusively Phase One domain and the latter involve comparison of identical lemmas across the two phases.

Naturally enough, the explanatory power of the S/T framework is most readily reflected in the “vertical” readings which illustrate the case for war construed as a response to a tangible, physical threat. Within the first category, there is a striking gap between the vast number of hits indicating the US, the central IDC (involving the major discourse parties such as the speaker and the direct audience), and the relatively limited number of hits indicating the other IDCs (e.g. some other democracies sharing the US principles of freedom, equality, etc.). This difference reflects the predominant rhetorical ploy of Phase One, the strategy of alerting the American addressee to the proximity of physical danger following from the alleged possession of WMD by the Iraqi regime and, consequently, terrorist organizations such as Al-Qaeda. Since the most desired, home-front success of this strategy depends on the US addressee’s conceptualization of the threat as maximally realistic and thus demanding a quick and radical response, the primary scope is temporarily narrowed down to cover the principal IDCs. In other words, although the overall range of the threat may be worldwide, it is the temporary centralization of the anticipated impact that ensures the fastest legitimization effects regarding the response, involving the very commencement of military operations, the funding priorities, etc.

In contrast to the above, the difference in the number of hits indicating the major ODCs (“Iraq” and “terrorists”) is rather insignificant. In fact, what we’re dealing with here is a conflation of the two concepts, which results in the perception of the Iraqi regime in terms of a terrorist entity representing a major threat to countries conceptualized as IDC elements. The conflation process relies heavily on the textual proximity of the two lemmas and, while Table 1 does not give this information, it should be noted that most of the time “Iraq” and “terrorists” occur in sufficient

syntactic closeness to swiftly generate a link of relationship. Furthermore, as can be seen from the ultimatum excerpt, they are often construed within one causative pattern. The overall proximization effect of such a conflation is that, with the 9/11 analogy constantly in operation, an Iraqi threat is virtually becoming a terrorist threat and vice versa.

The concept of “threat,” involving the anticipated impact of ODCs on the IDC elements, brings us to considerations of the relative distance between the two domains, a coordinate defined by VPs constituting the third category of the S/T framework. Since the success of the proximization strategy depends on the construal of the eventual clash between the ODC and the IDC entities, the most salient lemmas are those which indicate a conflict-bound movement on the part of both ODCs and IDCs, though the latter can also be construed as passive or inert and thus easily “invadable.” As can be seen from Table 1, the overall number of hits referring to both domains is largely comparable in terms of VP occurrence, however, on the ODC side there is a remarkable role played by the “WMD” complementation, which will cease in importance as the war goes on. Furthermore, it is worth noting that the presence of the IDC-related lemmas indicating both activity (as in “head”) and inertia (as in “drift”) reflects two and apparently conflicting characteristics of the spatial-temporal proximization rhetoric. One is a desire to justify the extremely radical response to the threat, which entails measures such as adding the maximum of momentum to the picture of the event stage—and hence the lemmas such as “head”—while the other is an equally dire need to enhance the spirit of leadership of the US president and the administration, by portraying their determination and resolve in a stark contrast to the general aura of passivity (viz. “drift”).

The fourth category, involving VPs of action conceptualized as indicators of contact between ODCs and IDCs, features lemmas directly responsible for the pragmatic impact of spatial-temporal proximization. The pervasiveness of “destroy” (which obviously occurs in phrases where an ODC element is the agent) is staggering, and so is the difference in the use of “confront,” a lemma occurring 2.6 times more frequently with an IDC-related agent than with an ODC-related one. The fact that the ODC-governed “destroy” easily surpasses in number the IDC-governed “confront” corroborates the existence of two regularities. First, as the war begins the most dynamic element of the event stage is Iraq and its alleged terrorist allies, and it is their (anticipated) actions that serve as a basis for most of the spatial-temporal proximization rhetoric. Second, as the ODC elements threaten to invade the deictic center, the IDCs (and the US in particular) are construed as steering a middle course between the pursuit of

defensive measures and the legitimization of a pre-emptive strike. The duality of the stance adopted by the IDCs is expressed precisely in the use of the lexical item “confront,” which implies a weaker or a stronger response to the ODC threat. Thus, in a sense, the second regularity is in line with the conflicting characteristics of the spatial-temporal proximization rhetoric that have been postulated with regard to the occurrence of VPs of motion and directionality. It is important to observe that while “confront” is a popular lexical choice in IDC-related phrases, its occurrence with ODC-related agents is minimal. This finding clearly contributes to the feasibility of the S/T module in bringing on a *causative* picture of the Iraqi war. Apparently, it is the Iraqi side that is the instigator of the conflict and the US takes up a merely self-defensive role. The idealistic connotations of “confront” and its general tendency to take on such appealing lexical items as “poverty,” “misery,” “injustice” or “danger,” some of the phrases indeed coming up in the corpus, only add to the picture.

While we will eventually find the fifth and the sixth category of the S/T framework conducive to many axiological considerations and thus a borderline case deserving a complex theoretical account, let us acknowledge that the lexical items included in these two classes are primarily part and parcel of the spatial-temporal premise for war, at least in terms of the legitimization of the initial strike. This time the “vertical” differences in the number of the particular lemmas are of secondary importance; what matters, however, is their combined occurrence i.e. the total number of hits reflecting the key concepts of “threat,” “danger,” “tragedy” and “catastrophe.” The number, 328, is massive by itself but consider that *all* these hard-hitting words occur, within a cause-and-effect pattern, in phrases involving the spatial coordinates of IDC and ODC, as well as the mobile coordinate, which altogether define the spatial arrangement of major forces of the Iraqi conflict. Thus, the main elements in the arrangement substantially profit from the appeal of “potential contact” and “actual effect” concepts – in the sense of enhancing their own status and pragmatic force. Still, the most convincing argument for the validity of the fifth and the sixth category members in the spatial-temporal proximization strategy is perhaps the dramatic decline in the occurrence of the four lemmas in Phase Two where, as will be seen from the axiologically profiled analysis, the premise for war is no longer the narrowing of the physical distance between the ODC and the IDC entities.

In fact, the axiological aspect comes up already in many of the “horizontal” readings of Table 1, but we shall address these first from the perspective of their original scope, i.e. a contribution to the spatial-

temporal matrix. Within the first two categories, there is a remarkable increase in the number of hits indicating IDCs, at the expense of the ODC-related lemmas. This proves, following the original function of the S/T module and without yet engaging in ideological considerations, that in Phase One of the Iraq war the event stage is indeed dominated by the (anticipated) activity of ODCs and that the construal of the latter as physically threatening the members of the deictic center is the cornerstone of spatial-temporal proximization as well as the major premise for legitimization of the IDC response to the threat. The activity of the ODCs is salient in the relatively large number of VPs containing lemmas which involve the steady closing of the gap between the ODC and the IDC entities (viz. “expand,” category three). This process is construed as momentous and inherently devastating, which can be seen from the unbalanced, 105:30 ratio characterizing the Phase One–Phase Two distribution of the “destroy” lemma, within the fourth category. Finally, the picture of the proximity of the threat is made complete by the vast number of lemmas indicating (effects) of the potential impact of ODCs on the deictic center—the “horizontal” reading of hits within the fifth and the sixth category shows, by comparison with the timeframe of Phase Two, how important these lemmas are for the complex strategy of spatial-temporal proximization.

4. Limitations of the S/T framework and implications for an axiological study

It seems that the six categories of the spatial-temporal framework of proximization are largely capable of defining and measuring, in the very “bottom” lexical terms, the character and intensity of the “legitimization via proximization” strategy applied at the outset of the Iraq war, whose initial premise was the alleged possession of weapons of mass destruction by Saddam Hussein’s regime. There is a good reason to believe that they could in fact account for any lexical groundwork of proximization that draws on the presence of a material entity which can be construed as IDC-threatening and thereby necessitating a pre-emptive response. Furthermore, the last two categories of the framework, as well as the lemmatic-numerical differences that the application of the framework yields with regard to a more temporally extensive development of the discourse stage (viz. the cross-phasal lexical readings above), appear to possess explanatory power that goes beyond a merely spatial-temporal analysis and entails a more complex, axiological study. Still, such a refined analysis, one that could explain conditions for the continuity of

legitimization and, specifically, the essence of compensation for a loss of the material premise for proximization, cannot entirely rely on the interpretation of figures generated by the S/T module, even if they spread across the two phases. As has been mentioned before, the S/T parameter is insufficient to explain some of the more temporally-extensive legitimization processes since they are characteristic of a growing likelihood of construal shifts occurring as a result of extralinguistic (mainly geopolitical) changes which make the kind of construal of some entities (for instance, the construal of the *threat* concept in physical or non-physical terms) dependent on the prior development of events on the discourse stage. Thus, while we might want the spatial-temporal module to contribute to the description of complex legitimization processes, the *redressability* of legitimization which normally pertains to these processes can only be defined (and, above all, measured) if there is a complementary framework whose applicability is to the whole period under analysis but whose origins are in the question of *compensation* which underlies the time span following the loss of the initial legitimization premise. The latter condition is a prerequisite for the framework of *axiological proximization* which will be developed below. In constructing it, we will utilize, on the one hand, observations of the diminishing role of the S/T proximization rhetoric and, on the other, findings from a formal typological study of lexical items making up the “compensatory,” ideologically-loaded stance. Our data will continue to be the “Phase One–Phase Two” corpus of the 64 presidential addresses, with “Phase One” (34 speeches) symbolizing the WMD-based argument pursued in the early stages of the Iraq war (March–November 2003), and “Phase Two” (30 speeches, December 2003–June 2004) referring to an updated and refined rhetorical pattern showing little attachment to the initial argumentative premise.

4.1. The emergence of an axiological perspective on proximization

The apparent loss of the main argument for going to war in Iraq (i.e. the alleged possession of weapons of mass destruction by Saddam Hussein’s regime) means a redefinition of the pro-war rhetoric. At the conceptual level of the STA model, this change is marked by the emergence of the two simultaneously occurring phenomena: a decline in the spatial-temporal proximization, and a corresponding increase in the slightly more “universal,” axiological proximization. We shall start the analysis by looking at the former trend i.e. from some observations on the diminishing role of the S/T-based rhetoric, a tendency which can be sensed

evaluations of) the different stages of physical contact between IDCs and ODCs along the formerly established “spatial impact” axis (“head,” “threat,” “danger,” “catastrophe”). The *WMD* concept is thus less frequently invoked not only because the distribution of the corresponding lexeme has been minimized (note the dramatic 88-to-6 fall), but also because the whole volume of the “traffic” along the spatial impact axis has shrunk—there is a much smaller representation of the ODC agents and, significantly, the projected effects of the IDC-ODC clash are not necessarily construed as physically annihilating. The latter fact is best corroborated by the 45-to-7 drop in the distribution of “catastrophe,” a lemma conceptually related to a specific act of annihilation which normally involves the use of weapons of mass murder.

Most of the figures in Table 1 and Table 2 not only define the framework of the spatial-temporal proximization as such, but also, as the importance of the latter diminishes, effectively initiate the description of all the “compensatory” regularities. It is interesting to see how the select numbers, notably the ones that are absent from Table 2 but originally present in the Table 1 compilation, elegantly mirror the Phase Two change of emphasis, from spatial-temporal to axiological proximization. Let us isolate a group of lemmas whose Phase One–Phase Two ratios invite a promising (though of course tentative before the axiological lexical framework is provided) explanation of this change:

Table 3. Phase One–Phase Two select ratios of lexical realizations of the spatial-temporal proximization framework: “prompts” for an axiological perspective

Key lemma or concordance	Phase One–Phase Two ratio
<i>United States</i> or <i>America</i>	426:613
<i>free</i> and/or <i>democratic world</i> (inclusive of synonyms such as <i>people</i>)	194:415
<i>expand</i> (of ODCs, without reference to <i>WMD</i>)	61:55
<i>tragedy</i>	60:55

How do we find these figures useful for axiological considerations? Recall the mechanism of axiological proximization the way it has been pre-postulated in 1. and 2. and add the later postulates about the temporal extensiveness and the ideological variability of legitimization processes involving proximization as a whole. The emerging perspective is that axiological proximization consists in the construal of alien ideological

beliefs and values relative (spatially and temporally) to the axiological background of the self, or the dominant ideology of the whole deictic center. It is, essentially, neither a physical phenomenon nor a temporal one; rather, it involves the *continual* narrowing of the gap between two different and opposing ideologies (ODCs' vs. IDCs') whose clash *could* prompt *physical* events construed within the S/T dimension.

While spatial-temporal proximization can be effected through a construal of intense activity of ODCs, with a relatively smaller share of agency on the part of IDCs (viz. Phase One of the war), axiological proximization needs a much stronger "IDC contribution." Otherwise, any account of the axiological composition of ODC parties remains insufficient for proximization purposes. By being naturally distant from the deictic center, the ODCs are initially less well defined and, usually, need to be juxtaposed against the IDCs, in order to become distinctive enough for the axiological proximization to work. Thus, if the government of a country such as Iraq is to be conceptualized as a "regime," and if a continuing solidification of this regime is to be construed as a threat to "all democratic world," the latter must first be described in due quantitative detail and in such a way that the addressee receives a broad spectrum of "antithesis triggers." These are, from the axiological perspective, all the ideological premises that the addressee identifies with and, consequently, whose conceptual oppositions he or she would find not only unacceptable but also plainly threatening.⁶

All this explains why Phase Two sees a radical increase in the number of the IDC-related lemmas, especially the NPs indicating the discourse stage agents (cf. Table 1, ctg. 1, recapitulated in the first two lines of Table 3 above). Particularly striking is, obviously, the increase in those IDC

⁶ This echoes Capone's (2008) and Duranti's (2006b) ideas of shifting responsibility for adopting a particular course of action, from the political speaker, to the addressee – whose beliefs and ideals are ultimately responsible for the proposed measures. In building up the IDC-ODC opposition, Bush makes use of the American people's predispositions, "in order to show that he correctly represents the needs and sentiments of his nation, thus being entitled to represent them as a political leader and to do what is good for them" (Capone 2008: 88). In a broader perspective, most of the communication of ideology in Bush's speeches on the Iraq war (especially in Phase Two) is also congruent with what Duranti (2006a) refers to as a complex *translocutionary act*, an attempt to construe messages "jointly" with the addressee. Such a goal often involves using intrinsically vague concepts in order to get the addressee to exercise the authorial rhetorical work. We shall see in section 5.1 below that in invoking such notions as "threat" or "danger", Bush relies on his audience to fill in the exact meanings and thus co-assume responsibility for the effects these meanings might have on the unfolding policies.

lemmas which define the non-US deictic center entities (194 to 415, in the case of “free” and/or “democratic world” and the synonyms). Of course, such a broadening of the geopolitical spectrum of the Iraqi conflict (note that an extended representation of IDCs entails an extended representation of their activity fields) means that the war is no longer construed in terms of a clash of particularized interests held by a limited number of parties; instead, the reasons for the ongoing US involvement have, apparently, a deeper ideological anchoring. The latter gives a license, valid both prospectively and retrospectively, to pursue actions whose sheer range justifies a certain degree of fallibility; logically, if the IDC agents operate multidirectionally and on a global scale, one cannot expect unequivocally positive effects. Thus, as we shall see later and especially from the text of the Whitehall address, a crucial rhetorical ploy of Phase Two is treating the Iraqi operation in terms of “one of the many,” which opens up a most comfortable possibility of construing select negative aspects of the (military) involvement as virtually unavoidable given the size of the issue at stake.

Most of the textual examples of the Phase Two axiological proximization, though not all, reveal the following regularity. First, there is a description of the ideological composition of the IDC parties. Then, a temporarily static juxtaposition is built against the rather vague category of ODCs—after all, with the WMD premise and the 9/11 analogy both missing from the argument, the invoked antagonistic values can only occasionally be ascribed to concrete countries or groups. Finally, in line with the essence of the concept of proximization as such, the ODC-related values are construed as dynamic, in the sense of potentially prompting actions which could involve a physical IDC-ODC clash. This is where the future-oriented argument ends. At the same time, however, a stance of legitimization of the IDCs’ activity is maintained retrospectively through multiple references to the ideologically alien (if not just plainly abhorrent) past actions of the principal ODC (i.e. the Iraqi regime) in and before Phase One of the war:

The work of building a new Iraq is hard, and it is right. And America has always been willing to do what it takes for what is right. But as democracy takes hold in Iraq, the enemies of freedom will do all in their power to spread violence and fear. [...] Let me repeat what I said on the afternoon of December the 14th: the capture of Saddam Hussein does not mean the end of violence in Iraq. We still face terrorists who would rather go on killing the innocent than accept the rise of liberty in the heart of the Middle East. (January 20, 2004)

America and all freedom-loving countries are fighting on the side of liberty—liberty in Iraq, liberty in the Middle East and beyond it. This objective serves the interests of the Middle East, of the United States and of the whole democratic world. As the greater Middle East increasingly becomes a place where freedom flourishes, the lives of millions in that region will be bettered, and the American people and the entire world will be more secure. [...] As the June 30th date for Iraqi sovereignty draws near, a small fraction is attempting to derail Iraqi democracy and seize power. In some cities, Saddam supporters and terrorists have struck against coalition forces. In other areas, attacks were incited by a radical named Muqtada-al-Sadr, who is wanted for the murder of a respected Shiite cleric. Al-Sadr has called for violence against coalition troops, and his band of thugs have terrorized Iraqi police and ordinary citizens. These enemies of freedom want to dictate the course of events in Iraq and to prevent the Iraqi people from having a true voice in their future. They want America and our coalition to falter in our commitments before a watching world. In their aspirations, they are a threat to all democratic people and to the people in our own country. (April 10, 2004)

In these two excerpts, the axiological composition of IDCs involves i) a full and unfaltering commitment to universally acceptable norms and values (“democracy,” “freedom,” “liberty,” the economic well-being of the people salient in “the lives of millions in that region will be bettered,” etc.), and ii) a commitment to steadfast, continual enactment of these values (“has always been willing to do what it takes for what is right,” “are fighting on the side of,” etc.—note the use of progressive forms). Antithetical to this groundwork is the ensuing description of the ODCs’ ideology which involves the rule of dictatorship (“a small fraction [...] want to dictate the course of events in Iraq”), giving rise to “violence” and “fear.” The ODCs are then construed as potentially invading the IDCs’ home territory or the territories which have been converted to the IDCs’ ideology (“will do all in their power to spread [violence and fear],” “is attempting to derail Iraqi democracy and seize power,” “are a threat to all democratic people and to the people in our own country”). Finally, throughout the entire account, painful memories of the Iraqi regime (“would rather go on killing the innocent,” etc.) are invoked (whether directly or by analogy), in order to strengthen the legitimization of the ongoing US involvement in Iraq as a whole.

5. The axiological (A) proximization framework

The goal of the axiological proximization framework is, analogically to the S/T framework presented in 3., to provide a set of criteria and

categories whereby one can define the lexical components of axiological proximization, in order to measure the axiological proximization (balancing) effects between different phases of the entire legitimization process i.e., in our case, between Phase One and Phase Two (or perhaps reversely, Phase Two and Phase One, considering that the analysis of axiological proximization is anchored in the question of compensation for a legitimization premise whose loss marks the end of “Phase One”). The intensity of these effects can be partly foreseen from the qualitative considerations thus far and, while we want precise lexical data to complement the picture in a quantitative manner, it seems logical to start from what the functional analysis of the sample texts has shown. Thus the axiological proximization framework, apart from its obvious roots in foci missing from the S/T model, draws on the ingredients/stages of the IDC-ODC axiological conflict as described above: the conflicting ideological characteristics of IDCs and ODCs, and the possibility of the ODC-related antagonistic values materializing within the deictic center. Altogether, we arrive at the following four categories of the framework:

- 1) Noun phrases (NPs) expressing abstract notions conceptualized as values and/or value sets / ideologies of IDCs;
- 2) Noun phrases (NPs) expressing abstract notions conceptualized as values and/or value sets/ideologies of ODCs;
- 3) Linear discourse sequences involving
 - 3a) Ctg. 2 NP, embedded in or elaborated on by a “departure VP” (VP1), to produce the *remote possibility* script,
 - 3b) NP expressing (effect of) IDC-ODC physical contact (conflict), embedded in or elaborated on by a “destination VP” (VP2), to produce the *actual occurrence* script,

in which the 3a-3b change in the scripts has a value set / ideology of ODCs *materialize* in the form of IDC-ODC physical contact (conflict);

- 4) NPs expressing abstract notions conceptualized as effects of IDC-ODC physical contact (conflict), NOT embedded in or elaborated on by a “destination VP” (VP2).

Admittedly, the composition of some of the categories, esp. 3), is complex enough to require a thorough text explanation. The following excerpts come from Bush's Whitehall Palace address of November 19, 2003. As I have remarked before, this speech can be considered a manifesto of the Phase Two rhetoric in the Iraq war:

[...] The greatest threat of our age is nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons in the hands of terrorists, and the dictators who aid them. This evil might not have reached us yet but it is in plain sight, as plain as the horror sight of the collapsing towers. The danger only increases with denial. [...] By advancing freedom in the greater Middle East, we help end a cycle of dictatorship and radicalism that brings millions of people to misery and brings danger and, one day, tragedy, to our own people. By struggling for justice in Iraq, Burma, in Sudan, and in Zimbabwe, we give hope to suffering people and improve the chances for stability and progress. [...] The stakes in that region could not be higher. If the Middle East remains a place where freedom and democracy do not flourish, it will remain a place of stagnation and anger and violence for export. And as we saw in the ruins of the towers, no distance on the map will protect our lives and way of life [...]

The categories 1), 2) and 4) are, compared to 3), relatively straightforward and thus we shall illustrate them first. Category 1) involves lexical items whose collective function is to define, in terms of a set of value-positive abstract concepts, the ideological groundwork of the IDC agents. In the text above these are, chronologically, the lexemes such as “freedom,” “justice,” “stability,” “progress” and “democracy.” Opposing this groundwork are the ODC-related lexemes which make up a set of value-negative concepts captured in the second category – “threat,” “evil,” “danger,” “dictatorship,” “radicalism,” “anger” and “violence.” The last NP-based category, 4), involves items such as “horror,” “misery” and “tragedy,” which lexicalize conceptualizations of physical contact between IDCs and ODCs. Of course, there is a certain degree of simplification and fuzziness involved, as conceptualizations of e.g. “threat” and “danger” are at the same time construals of elements of the antagonistic ideologies as such and construals of potency these elements exhibit in terms of materialization (cf. Pomeroy 2005, Hartman 2002) within the IDC territory. Furthermore, the fourth category must include not only the concepts which come explicitly in the form of the corresponding lexical items, but also the ones that need to be worked out inferentially in a manner similar to recovering implicatures (cf. e.g. Levinson 2000). Take, for instance, the closing excerpt “no distance on the map will protect our lives and way of life” – while no lexicalization of the effect of the IDC-